The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME XXV NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 26, 1921 NUMBER 321

Contents

The Week 237
Editorials
The French Cabinet Crisis..... 240
Finance and the Building Inquiry..... 241
The Moon-Calf at Large..... 243
Pure Charity 244
The "Law" and Labor..... 245
General Articles
The Storm-Centre of Reaction.....
.....Miles Everett Ross 249
When Autumn's Fruit (Verse)..... 251
Women In Industry.....Esther E. Lape 251
The Fairy Tales of Chesterton.Peter Constable 253
Lacrimae Rerum (Verse)..... 255
What Is Behind the Open Shop Crusade?.....
.....Savel Zimand 255
On Safeguarding Maternity....Louis I. Dublin 257
Penreb's Tomb (Verse) 258
Freedom of Speech and States Rights.....
.....Zechariah Chafee, Jr. 259
Correspondence 262
Verse 264
Mr. Chesterton Speaks.....F. H. 265
Reviews of Books
Our Common Humanity.....Ordway Tead 266
George Meredith.....S. C. C. 267
Shadow Shapes.....R. L. 268
The Road to Castaly.Constance Mayfield Rourke 270

The Week

SOMETHING of Senator Harding's present state of mind can be guessed from his request to have the simplest possible inaugural ceremony. His message to those who were arranging a fête worthy to celebrate the return, after eight years of Democratic severity, of Washington's exiled society, is obviously the message of a deeply troubled and sincere man. "I wish you . . . to know that the impression of extravagant expenditure and excessive cost would make me a very unhappy participant . . . . it is timely to practice the utter denial of public expenditure where there is no real necessity." There is more anxiety than pompousness here. Something of spiritual distress, of humility and perplexity in his newly acquired eminence, is to be read between these lines.

APPARENTLY Mr. Harry M. Daugherty leads in the race for Attorney-General. For Postmaster-General, Senator Harding may choose either Mr. Will Hays or Mr. A. Tobias Hert. It is just possible that all three will be in the cabinet. What are their qualifications? One of them managed Senator Harding's pre-convention campaign; another was chairman of the Republican National Committee; the third was National Committeeman from Kentucky. Even if it requires some ability to reach such high positions in politics, evidently these men would be picked for the politics rather than the ability. For all we know Mr. Daugherty may be as good as Mr. Palmer, and Mr. Hays might make an efficient postmaster. Certainly Mr. Palmer and Mr. Burleson—both of them political appointees—have left records that will be painfully easy for their successors to beat. It would be foolish of course, to imagine that such purely political appointments are the exception. Political appointees have been found in almost every President's cabinet, where, if their presence is necessary, it is none the less to be regretted. But in the case of Senator Harding there seems to be no such necessity. Why cannot he realize that, since November 2nd, he is no longer under obligation to any one? There is no excuse for a Daugherty or a Hert in the cabinet of a President elected by a plurality of seven million.

WHEN Viscount Ishii gave the text of the Anglo-Japanese treaty of July 13, 1911, to Mr. C. A. Selden, the New York Evening Post's correspondent in Paris, with the remark that there was nothing secret about it, much wind was taken out of the sails of the people—there are many of them—who think the possibility of war with Japan would mean war with England too, and who see in this double threat reason to increase our armaments. For one clause of this treaty—Article IV—means plainly that England is under no obligation to help Japan in a war with the United States. Its exact words are worth noting:

> Article IV—Should either high contracting party conclude a treaty of general arbitration with a third Power

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it is agreed that nothing in this agreement shall entail upon such contracting party an obligation to go to war with the Power with whom such treaty of arbitration is in force.

Furthermore, Viscount Ishii says that far from having any hostile intentions towards us, it was Japan herself that suggested inserting these words in the original agreement of 1905, when it seemed likely that the United States would try to secure an arbitration treaty with England. Such an arbitration treaty now exists.

THE automobile industry is the first to ask for a reduction of the tariff on foreign importations. The representatives of the National Automobile Chamber of Commerce before the House Ways and Means Committee, have suggested lowering the duty on high-priced foreign cars from 45 per cent to 30 per cent. They argue that, from the government's point of view, the direct decrease in revenue might be more than offset by an increase in the volume of importation, and, from the point of view of their own industry, a reduction would prevent foreign discrimination against American automobiles. The automobile manufacturers make a stronger argument still: a reduction would help other nations to get on their feet, and build up their lost buying power to what would in the end be our profit as well. This is a view of "protection" as rare as it is enlightened.

THE State Department, through Mr. Norman Davis, has after a silence of several months at last replied to the criticisms of the administration's Russian policy circulated during the campaign by the League of Free Nations Association. In its rejoinder the League of Free Nations Association analyses Mr. Davis's statement and concludes that the present position of the State Department as represented by Mr. Davis, is, briefly, this:

1. Relief for Soviet Russia not only will not be hindered, but will be encouraged so far as possible.
2. Cooperation by granting passports to the Soviet borders will be extended to travelers to and from Soviet Russia.
3. The United States is not committed, and it does not propose to be committed to further schemes of Russian intervention.
4. The United States will treat the Soviet government and Russian citizens in substantially the manner in which the unrecognized government of Mexico and Mexican citizens are treated.

On its face this is a fairly liberal position. That there are grave discrepancies between the State Department's present theory of Russian relations and its past practice will be evident to anyone who examines closely both Mr. Davis's letter and the Association's reply.

THE New York Tribune thinks the New Republic has "put itself in the position of upholding a flagrant case of militarism and reaction in Germany," because, in our issue of January 12th, we wrote as follows: "The German position, that disarmament of Bavarian and East Prussian guards is for the present impossible and dangerous, seems reasonable." We still think it reasonable. Marshal Foch's report showed that in many other more important respects Germany had fully come up to her disarmament requirements. And to force disarmament of the Bavarian home-guards might have provoked just such an attempt at "restoration of the former régime" as the Tribune, as well as we, knows would be fatal. Besides, England's attitude in forcing France to abandon the threats of invasion of the Ruhr, and to give Germany an extension of time, proves that no less conspicuous a "pro-German"—the term the Tribune barely refrains from applying to us—than Mr. Lloyd George also thought there was reason in Germany's declaration that this piece of disarmament was at the present time both dangerous and impossible, and should be undertaken gradually.

LABOR has charged the railroads with laying off the men in their own shops and then giving the repair work to outside companies at a greatly increased cost, for the double purpose of increasing the profits of the outside companies—in which they are financially interested—and of forcing labor to submit to their own "open-shop" terms. These accusations have been made by W. Jett Lauck, on behalf of the International Association of Machinists, before the Interstate Commerce Commission; and by B. M. Jewell, President of the Railway Employees Department of the A. F. of L., before the United States Railway Labor Board. Their complaints—essentially the same—are that the railroads laid off from 32,000 to 50,000 men in their own repair shops, forcing them to seek reemployment on non-union conditions with the independent equipment companies to which the railroads are now letting their repair contracts. Locomotives, ordinarily repaired for $4000 or $5000, under these circumstances cost from $18,000 to $20,000 to overhaul. As the country's yearly locomotive repair bill is over half a million, so runs the complaint, this placing of contracts with the companies whose directorates interlock with the railroads' will cost another unnecessary half billion. These overcharges, says Mr. Jewell, are a drain on the government, "by reason of the government guarantee established under the transportation act." Both Mr. Lauck and Mr. Jewell lay the final blame at the door of the banks which con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trol railroads and equipment companies through interlocking directorates.

THESE are serious charges, to which the railroads have so far made no effective answer. But when we recall that the railroads have tried their best to secure a suspension of the clause of the Clayton act to prohibit their buying materials from companies in which they were financially interested, and that they have decided to ignore the national Labor boards and substitute local agreements, there seems to be considerable foundation for them. If the railroads are inflating their operating costs by having other companies, of the same financial ancestry, do their work for them, this is plainly a matter for the Interstate Commerce Commission to investigate thoroughly. As to the charge that the railroads are preparing to destroy the labor organizations, in the present state of things, no one but labor itself is in a position to fight back effectively.

MR. JOSEPH H. DEFREES, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, has informed the National Educational Association that the majority of the country's 600,000 schoolteachers are themselves under-educated. Of this total, he says, 100,000 are under twenty-one; 30,000 have had no schooling beyond the eighth grade; 150,000 never went further than the third year of high school, and 480,000, or four-fifths of the teachers, have not had the two years of special training which is a recognized standard in other countries. The evil results of having our children taught by underpaid people barely more educated than their pupils, are obvious. In Mr. Defrees's mind the worst result is an increase in unrest, and in class-consciousness among the teachers. One can be unwilling to share his exaggerated fear of radicalism and still agree with him that the present condition of our schools and teachers is abominable.

NEW YORK was the scene of a strange spectacle on January 13th. Early in the evening police reserves were hurriedly mobilized on secret orders and scattered to guard all the banks, bridges, clubs, public buildings, private residences which might conceivably be on the "anarchist" bombing list. Supposedly the police acted on a tip from federal agents that someone was going to blow up something. At any rate they refused to tell the newspapers anything. But the newspapers had no trouble in finding out all the details, and next day most of them conspicuously published a complete list of the vulnerable points under guard. Had an anarchist been supreme at every city editor's desk, he could not have aided his colleagues more effectively. The newspapers practically said to the bombers: "It's no use blowing up so-and-so's house, this skyscraper, that bridge. Here's a complete list of all the points the police are afraid you will attack. So go ahead, comrades, you have a free field everywhere else." Evidently, if the newspapers really wanted to guard against an explosion, the last thing in the world to do was to publish the list. It is quite obvious that the press is more interested in exploiting a sensation than in preventing crime.

AN illuminating series of articles in the New York Herald, by a correspondent who visited the headquarters of the Invisible Empire at Atlanta, and talked with the Imperial Wizard, Colonel William J. Simmons, himself, shows how far the Ku Klux Klan has progressed since reconstruction times, and how an understanding of the problems of the day may bring it power and respect in the North. Once exclusively a device to terrorize the Negro, the Klan is making ready to play a bigger role. For the Negro is no longer the only threat to "white supremacy." We are menaced by vaster dangers. Let Colonel Simmons describe them:

> Already in the distance is heard the muttering sound of a rolling tide, growing stronger each year, seeking definitely to submerge the Caucasian race in America and to place in domination of politics and government the colored races and the foreign elements. . . . The only way the White Caucasian citizen can hold his supremacy is by . . . . organizing a solid, concrete body of secret membership . . . . of 100 per cent pure white Caucasian Americans. . . .

Is this the year 1920? And are we living in America—or the Caucasus?

IT was quite fitting for the Austrian government to give up an impossible job and hand over the responsibility for the running of the country to the Reparations Commission and the Allies, where it really rests. It was inevitable that the Treaty of St. Germain should reduce Austria to helplessness. Now the Allies, who chose to bring this cripple into the world, are faced with several unpleasant alternatives: to let things drift, or make a huge loan, or let Austria unite with Germany. In the opinion of Sir William Goode, the British member of the Austrian Reparations Commission, only an immediate loan of some 250 million dollars will prevent complete collapse, and collapse would lead either to an attempt by Austria to join Germany, or to her partition by the surrounding states, or to a Communist revolution. The loan he regards as insurance against disaster. It would not neces-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sarily be the beginning of prosperity. Austria's only road to prosperity is through union with Germany, or the other nations of the Danube valley. The case of Austria is clearly one of deliberate strangulation. And as we go to press the rumor is abroad that all communications with Vienna have been cut, and that a Soviet government has been established.

SOME weeks ago, when Major-General Strickland's report on the burnings in Cork was submitted to the British government, there were persistent and apparently well-founded rumors abroad that he had fixed blame for a considerable part of the arson on the government's own Black and Tans. Now we hear that even a summary of the military commission's findings may wait some time to see the light of day, and that the complete report will never be published at all. The official reason for this suppression is the promise made to certain individuals that their identity would not be revealed, and the impossibility of printing their testimony without giving their identity away. After the early rumors about it, this censoring of the report will make an ugly impression. It will be difficult to believe that Sinn Feiners were guilty of the outrages so long as the government is unwilling to tell the whole truth about them.

The French Cabinet Crisis

THE American observer of foreign affairs may be pardoned if his interest in the details of current French cabinet evolutions is rather faint. Any arrangements that may now be made will necessarily be extremely unstable. But behind these evolutions lie forces of a very different order of importance. What is going on is a process of deflation in French international policies.

The conditions created by the Treaty of Versailles led the French government far into the world of illusions. The Germans were to pay a colossal indemnity which would at last end the disorders in French public finance, and were to be held down by debt and dismemberment. The liberated nations of central and eastern Europe, and a reorganized and conservative Russia, were to give a broad basis for a new continental policy in which France would play a part even more significant than that which she played under the Grand Monarque. It was plain at the outset that France could not move very far along this path without parting company with England. The understanding with England, for which Delcassé had labored so unremittingly, to his own personal ruin, had indeed proved of inestimable value. Without it, the Germans would no doubt have finished the work of 1871 and would have reduced France to the condition of a second rate Power. But was there any need of the British prop, after the Treaty of Versailles? Such a need was not apparent to the politicians who floated into power on the wave of nationalistic enthusiasm that followed the victory. It is not even now apparent to Poincaré, nor perhaps to the majority in the Chambers, who may indeed be unrepresentative of the present state of French public sentiment, but who are nevertheless possessed of the power to make and break ministries.

But the really capable statesmen of France, men like President Millerand and Aristide Briand, can be under no illusions as to the military and political self-sufficiency of France. They must have reflected on the crumbling of the whole eastern policy of the chauvinists. The French-supported Russian reaction has met extinction. Poland, Czechoslovakia and Jugoslavia, though doubtless grateful for the support France gave to their aspirations in the past, and not unwilling still to draw upon French aid in case of need, have too scanty resources to do more than play their own game. French influence in Greece no longer exists, and there appears to be a growing coolness toward France in Rumania. The only point where France could build up really powerful support is in Hungary, but Magyar Francophilism springs from the hope that France may back Hungary in her plans for recovering territories wrested away by the peace settlement, or even in her plans for assuming leadership in a new Danubian confederacy. It is needless to dwell upon the liabilities that would attend a Franco-Magyar understanding. They would probably exceed its value.

The fact seems to be that, whatever might have been the case immediately after the German collapse, there is now no secure support for French policy anywhere east of the Rhine. France has her choice between virtual isolation and an understanding with England. But an understanding with England implies large concessions to English views as to what shall be done with the Continent. The French might find their advantage in keeping Germany politically impotent and industrially disordered. They might prefer to keep alive the national jealousies that pit Poland against Russia, Czechoslovakia and Jugoslavia against Hungary. Political chaos to the eastward is after all some sort of guarantee against a war of revenge. But England has not the least fear of a war of revenge. She knows that German military power can not recover within a generation, and she has too clear an understanding of the vicissitudes of diplomacy to shape her policies on hypotheses as to what may

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

happen after a half century. The dominant British interest is to restore peace, solvency and free movement of commerce on the Continent as a whole. And it is idle for the French to try to work in harmony with the British unless they are prepared to make concessions to that interest.

What this means is that somehow or other the French will have to reconcile themselves, in the next four months, to fixing the German indemnity at a figure that does not crush German economic life. They will have to cease looking for pretexts to seize the Ruhr industrial district and for a chance to effect the further dismemberment of Germany. They will probably have to come around to the British view on the subject of trading with Russia. All this, to be sure, is probably to the real advantage of France as well as of England. There would be no profit to France in an indemnity so exaggerated as to discourage all efforts to pay it. France would hardly recover her military expenditures if she occupied the Ruhr, and if she effected the separation of Bavaria, she would only make herself new military problems and reduce the chances of ever recovering on her indemnity claims. But it would be unreasonable to expect any large part of French public opinion to recognize that the national interest lies on the side of a policy of moderation. There has been altogether too powerful and persistent a propaganda for compelling Germany to pay more than there is any likelihood that she ever can pay. If it were revealed to the French from on high exactly what is the maximum they can ever get, they would no doubt be bitterly disappointed with the amount. All the more, any sum fixed after discussion with Germany at the instance of the allies of France will seem to a great part of the public a betrayal of French interests.

That is the condition the responsible statesmen of France have to face. They will have to reach a solution determined by the present international position of France, but without secure support in public opinion, and still less in the reactionary Chambers. It is a condition that precludes any sort of political certainty. Perhaps an adroit diplomatist like M. Briand may best succeed in adjusting French expectations to the possible. Perhaps the power will have to pass to a chauvinist like Poincaré in order that the onus of unpopular concessions may the more definitely rest upon British compulsion. There is danger in either course. For an understanding between the French and British peoples, vital to both, is difficult to establish and maintain, at best. Too much subtle political manoeuvring might be disastrous in the end to any such understanding. It might result in each nation's looking elsewhere for its political combinations, to the lasting detriment of European security.

Finance and the Building Inquiry

THE hunting down of wrong doers is no doubt the dramatic element in any such undertaking as the building investigation. If no Brindells and Hettricks had been discovered, the current news value of the inquiry would have been much less. But nobody can imagine that if all shady practices were exposed and corrected, the building industry would then move forward, fulfilling all the requirements of our urban populations. We might get rid of conspiracies and extortion, without making notable progress toward the housing of the multitudes. Waste and disorganization extort more dollars from the tenant than corruption and monopoly. They are a heavy tribute, from the point of those who pay them, but a tribute to an institutional stupidity that can not be visualized and hated.

That is all the more reason why the official inquiry soon, we hope, to be resumed, should be endowed with sufficient power to bring to light all the relevant facts. There is more to be learned about the general policies or lack of policies of the building contractors and the manufacturers of building materials, of the trade unions, of the transportation agencies, of the public authorities. But perhaps the most important subjects of all are the policies of the financial institutions. Credit is the life of trade. Whether a nation shall flourish or languish, as we can see from the state of Europe, depends upon its control of credit. The same thing is true of the several departments of a nation's economic life. It is a commonplace that before the war the domestic industries of France were held back by the policy of the great French financial institutions, which drained away the people's savings for investment in foreign government bonds. We are not here raising the question whether that was an expedient policy or not. French Russian investments confirmed the Franco-Russian alliance; French Turkish investments served to weaken German influence in Turkey. The point is that funds thus placed abroad were not available for domestic industrial and commercial development. The policies of a nation's financial institutions have a deal to do with a nation's economic anatomy. They may insure the full growth of one organ while starving another organ and inducing atrophy.

Now, what every intelligent citizen would like to know is what are the policies of our great financial institutions leading to? We are not greatly interested in the question whether an inquiry would disclose occasional wrong-doing. No doubt it would. Bankers and insurance magnates are human, and there are a great many of them. We do

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not expect the disclosure of practices that seriously compromise the solvency of our financial institutions. The relations between the financial institution and its immediate customers are already too closely regulated by law and custom to admit of gross abuses widely prevalent. But within the limits of law and custom and business honor there is yet a broad latitude of discretion. Our investment institutions, while observing every rule necessary for the protection of their customers, may still favor the development of large scale industries and discourage industries equally solvent but of less imposing proportions. They may still favor manufacturing or transport industries at the expense of housing. They might even favor concerns in which they were more or less directly interested, or concerns fighting for the "American" open shop scheme of industry or concerns favorable to unionism, without doing the humanly inconceivable.

We shall of course be told that all such hypotheses rest upon a misconception of the fundamental principle of private finance, to place funds impartially wherever the greatest profits are to be had, due allowance given to considerations of security and convenience. But the Hughes Insurance investigation showed quite clearly that no such principle operated without qualification at that time. There appears to be no reason for assuming that it operates now. If it were the financial practice to dispose of funds to the highest bidder, and if the directors of financial institutions stood altogether aloof from all other business interests, we might assume that credits were granted or withheld according to a simple mechanical principle involving no considerations of general policy at all. That is not, however, the way things work in real life. A good deal of discretion in the distribution of credits remains with the financial institution, and what it does with that discretion is a matter which concerns public policy. Not the financiers, as private persons, but the American people, through its representative organs, ought to decide whether building is to be encouraged or discouraged, whether industry is to be built up and agriculture neglected; in short, what the public policy involved in financial operations ought to be. This, we imagine, any public spirited financier would admit. He can not desire autocratically to determine matters which transcend his own sphere of profit making.

In supporting the movement for extending the scope of the building inquiry to include the financial institutions we are not in the least animated by a hope of startling disclosures. The only reason any one has for believing that there is anything startling to disclose consists in the circumstantial fact that the financial institutions are fighting the proposal. Not all of them, we suppose, but the campaign against the extension of the scope of the building inquiry is conducted under such dense cover that it is impossible to distinguish between those who are willing to let the public know what the public has a right to know and those who make a sacred vested interest out of business secrecy.

There is no difficulty in explaining why the few who really have something to hide should oppose the investigation. But why should the many make common cause with them? We hear it said that the methods of Mr. Untermeyer are objectionable in the extreme and tend to throw a shadow of guilt upon those who are perfectly innocent. A careful study of the recent hearings, however, would dispel any such notion. In those hearings certain witnesses were, indeed, quite mercilessly racked, but as the event usually showed those witnesses actually had something to conceal, and their best founded grievance was that Mr. Untermeyer's methods made concealment difficult. We hear it said that the financial institutions would be put to considerable expense in furnishing the information that might be required. That expense, however, would hardly represent more than an infinitesimal fraction on the business involved. We hear it said that any such inquiry would be a shock to credit and intensify the current depression. How could that be, unless the inquiry exposed practices which not only involved a questionable public policy, but threatened business solvency as well?

When the financial institutions have to deal with radical legislatures, backed by a powerful radical trend in public sentiment, they may have good reason to oppose investigation, of whatever character. They may assume that any action is unfavorable action. But what have they to fear from Governor Miller and the present legislature? What reason have they to feel concern over public sentiment at a time like this, when conservatism carries everything before it? If they were deliberately seeking an opportunity to present their own view of their policies before a favorably inclined public, what better chance could they expect than that which is now offered them? Do they regard themselves as farsighted in rejecting it? We do not. For it is widely believed that the policies of our financial institutions have had much to do with the building crisis. This impression may be kept ineffective for the present. But anyone who knows American political history will realize that such suppressed impressions have a habit of emerging at a later time, when the general mood of the public is not so favorable to dispassionate inquiry. It is doubtful whether financial institutions can ever afford to shun publicity, in a democracy. They certainly can not afford to shun it now, when our democracy happens to be colored by conservatism.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Moon Calf at Large

ON another page (255) we publish a brief anthology of the Open Shop Movement. One theme runs through all of it, that, in the words of the National Conference of State Manufacturers' Associations, all people "have the right to work when they please, for whom they please, and on whatever terms are mutually agreed upon between employee and employer." These are noble words. They evoke a sense of freedom that is not only idealistic but idyllic; they suggest a Golden Age in which compulsion and control, and the whole horrid apparatus of social organization, have disappeared, and nothing remains but the right to follow the fancy where it listeth. In short, the formula of the manufacturers' associations is the doctrine of philosophical anarchy in its purest and most absolute form. It presupposes a society of unlimited rights exercised without hindrance by the standard of individual pleasure.

The poet who conceived this utopia of the free was naturally not enslaved by the facts of life. Indeed he was not thinking of the world as it is, but of the world as in the millennium it ought to be. Now it is no task of ours to discourage the brave excitements of youth. These challenges to the social order, however reckless or immature, must be tolerated, in the confident hope that experience of life, a knowledge of the world, contact with practical affairs will gradually teach these mooncalves the sober and more prosaic truth. For of course any one who talks about the right to work when he pleases, for whom he pleases, is a mooncalf, even though he happens to be the hired publicity man of so respectable a crowd as the manufacturers' association of twenty-two states.

Let us imagine his utopia in action. John Smith, it happens, is pleased one fine morning to take a job. It occurs to him that he would rather enjoy driving the Twentieth Century Limited. So he walks into the office of the President of the New York Central Railroad and says: "It pleases me to work for you this morning. The train to be sure does not ordinarily start until 2:45, but I'll start now. I work when I please." "Right you are," says the President, "let us now mutually agree on terms. What'll you take for the job?" "Well," says John Smith, "Chicago does not interest me much, but I shall enjoy the ride. Let's make it an even twenty." "Too much," says the President. "I generally pay about ten." "Hm," says John Smith, "I tell you. Let's split the difference." "Fine," says the President, "in our country it is recognized as fundamental that we work when we please, for whom we please, and on whatever terms are mutually agreed upon. . . . You say you will start at once?" "Almost at once," says John. "I've got just thirty pages of the Age of Innocence to finish, and a luncheon engagement at the Union League Club to call off; I'll be ready around eleven."

Having stopped for a shave and a shine, John did not actually start till twelve-thirty. As the train sped up the Hudson Valley he drank in the air and thought that except in a Veronese at the Pitti and in two bits of early Ming that he had so loved when he was staying at Albemarle House with Margot and Colonel Repington, he had never seen such a celestial blue. Colonel Repington suddenly reminded him of lunch, and at Poughkeepsie he stopped, called up Franklin Roosevelt, and was welcomed with open arms. Mrs. Stratton was perfectly enchanting, and about five o'clock, lunch being over, John strolled down to the train, slowly finishing his excellent cigar. Towards seven he pulled into Albany, and took a cab to the Ten Eyck, where he thought he would change for dinner. A telegram from the perspicacious President was brought to him. It read: "Forgive the unwarranted intrusion upon your private affairs. A harsh and meddlesome government has been inquiring all afternoon when the mails are likely to reach Chicago. I realize that you work only when you please and for whom you please, but as one man to another, won't you advise me of your plans."

John thought this over for an hour or two, reflecting sadly on the increasing restriction of liberty due to the influence of Moscow, asked himself whether President Harding was by any chance infected with Bolshevism, and wondered whether to ring up Ralph Easley, the American Defense Society, or the Imperial Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan. On sober second thought he felt that he had better decide the question in the morning, when he was fresh from a good night's sleep. So he turned in, renewed his shaken spirits by reading a few resonant passages from the Weekly Review, and fell asleep, only to find himself in the midst of the wildest and most hideous nightmare.

As is usual in such dreams some features of the previous day's experience were reproduced, though distorted. He went in search of a job. But instead of finding his employer, the President, he was shunted from porters to ticket agents, and from ticket agents to employment offices, and from there to a long line of waiting men. Finally he was interviewed. His desire to run the Twentieth Century that afternoon was greeted with a roar of irreverent laughter, but he was told that he could try out as the second assistant helper on the local freight between Jericho and Mineola. He would

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

report at six A. M. The wages were $4.32. What, he didn't like this? He wanted to work when he pleased, for whom he pleased, on terms mutually agreed upon? He was welcome to try somewhere else. This was a free country, to be sure, but not for nuts. In the futile and exasperating manner of dreams, he repeated all this several times, being shunted about, standing in line, being told to take it or leave it, never once encountering a believer in the Open Shop. And just as he was trying to agree upon something with Mr. Gary, he woke up with a start, pinched himself, and thanked heaven that it was only a nightmare.

Whether John's experience or John's nightmare is nearer to the facts as they exist in 1921, we do not commit ourselves for fear of seeming to disagree with the fundamental principles of the Great Crusade. But on the off chance that John's nightmare might conceivably be true in two or three backward spots, we venture to set down a few beliefs about so distressing a condition. If we are wrong, if in this country, but for the trade unions, men have a right to work for whom they please, when they please, on terms mutually agreed upon, then nothing which follows is worth considering. For what follows departs from the view of the Open Shop enthusiasts only in this, that it considers not whether the "rights" exist, but whether any one can today exercise them. It assumes in other words that a right on which men cannot act is as valuable as property on the moon.

Those who are faint-hearted about the Open Shop Movement believe that the standards of employment, of discipline, of production, of pay, and of hours are no longer matters of individual fancy, but have to be fixed for whole industries. They, therefore, inquire who is to fix them, and they believe that the real meaning of what is called the Open Shop is the desire of the employer to fix them without consulting the men who are hired, are disciplined, do the manual work, receive the pay envelope, and punch the time clock. They are inclined to regard the phrases about the right to work when you please, for whom you please, on terms mutually agreed upon between employer and employee as an inaccurate, nay a highfalutin, description of what these manufacturers' associations are after. They come to the basic fact that standards have to be fixed by somebody. For a completely unstandardized industry is a sweatshop; a completely standardized industry, like steel, where the standards are fixed entirely by the employer is . . . . well, what is it? It is an industry where revolt is an institution. Therefore the critics of the Open Shop argue that the standards of an industry shall be fixed by agreement between an association of the workers and the organized employers. Apart from all considerations of human dignity, equality of bargaining power, or such things as justice and democracy, admittedly rather vague, they argue that a standard so fixed has an authority that it is not possible to achieve any other way. For it has the collective authority of the workers and of the whole industry behind it.

The evils of the closed union shops are manifest enough, and they do not argue for it. They argue for an open union, open to all qualified workers without discrimination, associated with the organized employers to fix standards of work, and with an impartial machinery to decide individual cases on the basis of the standards agreed upon. They assert that this is the only form of open shop adapted to modern industry. They claim that experience demonstrates, and that events will prove that the moon-calf conception of the open shop is as unworkable as every other kind of social anarchy.

Pure Charity

THERE is an old moral conundrum which poses a question of this sort: Suppose you were told that in the interior of Tibet lives a very wealthy old scoundrel whose heir you are. You have never seen the miserable creature. If it happened that by touching a button you could painlessly send him to glory, would you be tempted to push the button?

Mr. Hoover's appeal for the children of central Europe is the same conundrum, only reversed. Instead of a wealthy old scalawag there are destitute and innocent children; instead of a fortune to inherit, there is a lasting friendship to be made; instead of death, life; instead of cupidity to gratify, charity. Yet it is the same conundrum, because in the last analysis the moral problem is: how near must a thing be before it comes within the range of your conscience? What is the area of your sympathy? What is its latitude and longitude?

It has been demonstrated by the war that the scope of conscience is highly elastic, that Gopher Prairie can encompass a Belgium or a Serbia. But the present case is different. Belgium and Serbia were vivid parts of a vivid drama; symbols of a conflict in which most of us had already taken sides. But Austria today is drab and dreary, and though the children of Austria are as innocent as children anywhere, "Austria" is nothing but a dishevelled wreck. An appeal for Austrian children is therefore a pure appeal to charity, and a perfect test in cold blood of how far the American conscience, unstimulated by an heroic spectacle, can reach.

It will reach as far as the American imagination

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will reach, for almost nobody who has conceived the plight of the Austrian child, who has brought home to himself his own power of life and death, would deliberately choose to command death. If people go on paying the price of a child's life to sit in the first twelve rows of the most popular musical comedy in New York, it is because the words of the appeal have evoked no real image in their minds.

But in the minds of the devoted men and women who have volunteered for the campaign, and in wider circles like that of the moving picture managers, the image has become definite enough. In its clearest form, it is just sheer feeling for the ultimate value of all human life, and that feeling, rather than any prudential motive, is what makes it blessed to give. The best giving is without calculation. But there is one form of calculation that is as fine as pure charity because while it is just as disinterested, it involves the mind as well as the heart. That is the calculation that by this salvage of life there is being recruited for the American people in the storm centre of the world an army of friends. Those who give ten dollars receive a certificate for an invisible guest until the next harvest. It brings life to a human soul and self-respect to the host. But to their own children it brings an invisible friend, who will manage somehow in the troublesome years ahead, to see through the outcries and shibboleths of merely political contact between nations.

The "Law" and Labor

ON October 15th, 1914, President Wilson signed the Clayton act and commemorated labor's great interest in the historic occasion by presenting to Mr. Gompers the pen which brought the act into being. "This pen with which the President signed the Clayton bill," wrote Gompers, "has been added to the collection of famous pens at the A. F. of L. headquarters,—trophies of humanitarian legislation secured by the workers of America. This last pen will be given the place of greatest honor—it is symbolic of the most comprehensive and most fundamental legislation in behalf of human liberties that has been enacted anywhere in the world." And now, the pen of a majority of the Supreme Court has unwritten what Mr. Gompers believed the President's pen to have written.

The Supreme Court's decision in the Duplex Printing Company case has naturally aroused the passions of partisanship. Execration or jubilation marks the tone of current comment. What to Mr. Gompers is "a blow at human freedom," is interpreted by tory papers as "the Supreme Court rebukes the class struggle." We, too, deem the decision of great significance. Here was a statute upon which, as Mr. Gompers's eloquence attests, the highest hopes were based. It behooves us to try to understand on what these hopes were founded, and why they have been frustrated.

Ever since industrial conflicts became persistently acute in this country—that is for over twenty years—organized labor has been struggling, so far at least as the federal courts were concerned, against two drastic legal weapons, the injunction and the Sherman law. Disinterested opinion increasingly supported labor's complaint against the abusive exercise of injunctions as a mode of interfering in the industrial conflict by prohibiting specific labor tactics which alone render effective the abstract rights to organize and to strike. Similarly, the potential danger that the Sherman law might be invoked against trade unions was constantly flashed as a sword before labor. This threat was realized in the minds of labor by the decision in the Danbury Hatters' Case in 1908. But the case as a matter of fact involved liability for acts done, not for *being* a trade union. Yet labor, not unnaturally, feared in the existing legal atmosphere the threat of proceedings for dissolution of the American Federation of Labor itself, precisely as the French government recently proceeded against the Confédération Générale du Travail. The Danbury Hatters' Case undoubtedly added fresh impetus to the gathering momentum for relief. Labor, now supported by the progressive tide, had two objectives; one, to remove all possible doubt as to the legality of trade unions as such, and to withdraw their activities from the scope of the Sherman law; the other, to prohibit the use of injunctions against the conventional tactics of labor.

The Clayton act was intended to translate these objectives into law. Section 6 dealt with the first aim, Section 20 with the second. As a matter of fact, Section 6 is words and nothing else. What labor wanted and thought it got was the exemption of all labor controversies from the operation of the Sherman law. All Section 6 did was to declare that the Sherman law did not forbid the existence and operation of labor organizations—which the Sherman law never did, but merely applies to certain conduct in the course of its operations; and to permit their members to *lawfully* carry out their *legitimate* objects—which is another way of saying what is lawful shall be lawful! But Section 20 grappled in detail with the problem of legalizing specific acts which theretofore had run afoul of federal injunctions. It provided that the following familiar tactics of labor shall not be deemed viola-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions "of any law of the United States":

> Terminating any relation of employment, or
> Ceasing to perform any work or labor, or
> Recommending, advising or persuading others by peaceful means to do so, or
> Attending at any place where such person or persons may lawfully be, for the purpose of obtaining or communicating information, or
> Peacefully persuading any person to work or to abstain from working, or
> Ceasing to patronize or employ any party to such dispute, or
> Recommending, advising, or persuading others by peaceful and lawful means so to do, or
> Paying or giving to, or withholding from, any person engaged in such dispute any strike benefits or other moneys or things of value.

These acts having frequently been the basis of injunctions, Congress provided that thereafter they shall not be prohibited by injunction "in any case between an employer and employees, or between employers and employees involving or growing out of a dispute concerning terms or conditions of employment."

Against this background of the terms and the history of the Clayton act the facts of the Duplex Company's case must be projected. What are the facts? There are in the United States only four manufacturers of printing presses; and they are in active competition. Between 1909 and 1913 the machinists' union induced three of them to recognize and deal with the union, to grant the eight-hour day, to establish a minimum wage scale and to comply with other union requirements. The fourth, the Duplex Company of Battle Creek, Michigan, refused to recognize the union; insisted upon conducting its factory on the "open shop" principle; refused to introduce the eight-hour day and operated for the most part, ten hours a day; refused to establish a minimum wage scale; and disregarded other union standards. Thereupon two of the three manufacturers who had assented to union conditions, notified the union that they should be obliged to terminate their agreements with it unless their competitor, the Duplex Company, also entered into the agreement with the union, which, in giving more favorable terms to labor, imposed correspondingly greater burdens upon the employer. Because the Duplex Company refused to enter into such an agreement and in order to induce it to do so, the machinists' union declared a strike at its factory, and in aid of that strike instructed its members and the members of affiliated unions not to work on the installation of presses which the Duplex had delivered in New York. In a word the machinists supported the strike at the Duplex factory by a strike against its product in New York because of the common interests of the members of the machinists' union to resist an attack upon the standard of living secured for them by the union and maintainable, as they believed, only through the union. The Duplex Company thereupon sought to enjoin the officials of the machinists' union in New York from inducing their members not to work for the company or its customers in connection with the installation of its presses.

Here is a case, one would suppose, within the plain tenor of the Act of Congress—if Congress meant its words to have any efficacy at all. But the majority of the Court found no restraint in Section 20 against an injunction in this case. Clearly the acts enjoined are among the acts enumerated in Section 20 as not "held to be violations of any law of the United States." But the Supreme Court now decides that the effort of the New York machinists, by not working on Duplex presses, to secure union conditions for their fellow machinists in the Duplex Company's plant and thereby to maintain their own union conditions elsewhere is not a case "growing out of a dispute concerning terms or conditions of employment." Furthermore the Court holds the act does not apply to a case arising between an employer in Michigan and workers in New York not in its employ, but affected immediately by the conditions of employment in Michigan, because the immunity of the Clayton act is restricted to cases "between an employer and employees or between employers and employees." In other words, the Court reads this language as though Congress had written "between an employer and employees *in his employ*."

The upshot of the decision, in the naive but honest language of one judge, is that the Clayton act has legalized lawful strikes. The law is what it was before. Verily, the mountains labored and brought forth a dead mouse—except that now an employer can get an injunction against unions under the Sherman law, while formerly he had to be content with treble damages. Surely the layman will be puzzled. It must seem strange to him that language should so completely conceal thought, as the Supreme Court now finds Section 20 to have concealed it. It will seem incredible to anyone whose curiosity is stronger than his prejudices that an elaborate effort to *change* the law should turn out to be merely a reaffirmation of it. And surely lawyers would be as much puzzled as laymen—if this statute dealt with a non-contentious issue. It is an elementary principle of statutory construction that *some* effect must be given to legislation—all effect, in fact, that the traffic of the language will bear. This is a particularly binding rule when

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the history of the legislation shows that there were evils in the existing law and the legislature sought to remedy them. This is peculiarly the case of the Clayton act. "This statute," as the dissent points out, "was the fruit of unceasing agitation, which extended over more than twenty years and was designed to equalize before the law the position of workingmen and employer as industrial combatants. It was objected that due largely to environment, the social and economic ideas of judges which thus became translated into law were prejudicial to a position of equality between workingman and employer; that due to this dependence upon the individual opinion of judges, great confusion existed as to what purposes were lawful and what unlawful; and that in any event Congress, not the judges, was the body which should declare what public policy in regard to the industrial struggle demands..... By 1914 the ideas of the advocates of legislation had fairly crystallized upon the manner in which the inequalities and uncertainty of the law should be removed. It was to be done by expressly legalizing certain acts regardless of the effects produced by them upon other persons..... In other words, the Clayton act substituted the opinion of Congress as to the propriety of the purpose of certain acts for that of different judges; and thereby it declared that the relations between employers of labor and workingmen were competitive relations, that organized competition was not harmful, and that it justified injuries necessarily inflicted in its course."

How came it then that six justices of the Supreme Court have decided that Congress wrote words without meaning? It will not do to say "economic determinism." That still leaves open the question how "economic determinism" operates through judicial logic, and how it finds its opportunities for operation. We venture this analysis of the factors which underlie the opinion of Mr. Justice Pitney:

1. Facts are considered abstractly, and not as they are imbedded in the matrix of the industrial struggle. If one were to read only the opinion of the court one would be left with the impression that the machinists' union of some 60,000 ruthlessly sought to interfere with the business of the Duplex Company. In fact we are in the presence of a contest between employer and workers in which the employer's conduct not only affected the conditions of his own workers, but necessarily, in view of the competition of the industry, threatened the basic standards of life which the union had procured for its men elsewhere. Not a word of all this in the majority opinion, although the trial judge, who was able to estimate the facts at first hand wrote: "a careful reading of the entire record leads to the conclusion that, if men have a right to strike and to endeavor to prevail upon others to fail to work for the employer this is such a case as exemplifies careful, prudent and lawful conduct on the part of the employees."

2. Loose language in legislation dealing with matters of social policy enables judges to pour into the mold of ambiguity their own beliefs and hopes and fears, in a word, *their* social policy. Deceived by the process of logic and the language of law, judges fail to pierce the quivering and conflicting social issues underneath the thick phraseology of their prejudices. "The training of lawyers", wrote Mr. Justice Holmes long ago, "is a training in logic. The processes of analogy, discrimination and deduction are those in which they are most at home. The language of judicial decision is mainly the language of logic. And the logical method and form flatter that longing for certainty and for repose which is in every human mind. But certainty generally is illusion, and repose is not the destiny of man. Behind the logical form lies a judgment as to the relative worth and importance of competing legislative grounds, often an inarticulate and unconscious judgment, it is true, and yet the very root and nerve of the whole proceeding."

3. Therefore where the "law" is a process of judicial analogizing, or legislation is so drawn as to leave ample play for judicial "construction," the limits of the judge's experience with the actualities of life and the range of his imagination which determine his conception of social policy will determine the "law." In a word, unless legislation is most carefully drawn to accomplish a definitely conceived legislative policy the judges are the "law"—as they ultimately are as to all legislation, in this country, in view of their power to declare unconstitutional the most carefully devised legislation.—Here again, more than twenty-five years ago, Mr. Justice Holmes called attention "to the very serious legislative considerations which have to be weighed. . . . . To measure them justly needs not only the highest powers of a judge and a training which the practice of the law does not insure, but also a freedom from prepossessions which is very hard to attain. It seems to me desirable that the work should be done with express recognition of its nature. The time has gone by when law is only an unconscious embodiment of the common will. It has become a conscious reaction upon itself of organized society knowingly seeking to determine its own destiny."

If this explains, at least in part, the wherefore of the Duplex decision, what practical consequences are to be drawn? 1. It is safe to say, this is not

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the last of decisions adverse to labor's combative resources in the industrial struggle. Public opinion is likely to reflect the attitude of courts in restricting trial by combat. There is a very significant closing paragraph in Mr. Justice Brandeis's opinion:

> Because I have come to the conclusion that both the common law of a State and a statute of the United States declare the right of industrial combatants to push their struggle to the limits of the justification of self-interest, I do not wish to be understood as attaching any constitutional or moral sanction to that right. All rights are derived from the purposes of the society in which they exist; above all rights arises duty to the community. The conditions developed in industry may be such that those engaged in it cannot continue their struggle without danger to the community. But it is not for judges to determine whether such conditions exist, nor is it their function to set the limits of permissible contest and to declare the duties which the new situation demands. This is the function of the legislature which, while limiting individual and group rights of aggression and defense, may substitute processes of justice for the more primitive method of trial by combat.

In a word, organized labor must seek a new, or rather, a wider orientation than that which it has heretofore pursued. Through an intensive program of education, through the development of the cooperative movement, through a grappling with the basic problems of waste and disorganization of industry, through methods of industrial government a wider basis for labor's position in the state will be established and increasing strength will be attained.

2. The Duplex decision demonstrates anew labor's need for expert assistance. If the American Federation of Labor had been equipped with highly trained counsel, such a shabbily drawn piece of legislation as the Clayton act could not have been put on the statute books—at least not without Mr. Gompers knowing that he was being offered a gold brick. Careful counsel certainly would have guarded against the very contingency upon which the act has now shipwrecked. Instead of leaving to ambiguity the question whether the immunity against injunctions should be restricted to litigation between an employer and workmen in *his* employ, or is also to apply to cases where the "parties are generically the hired and the hirer," a careful draftsman would have insisted on some such safeguarding provision as is contained in the British Trades Disputes act of 1906, which specifically applies to workers "whether or not in the employment of the employer with whom a trade dispute arises." We hope that Mr. Gompers's recent consultations with Mr. Hoover and his engineers are significant of the recognition by the leaders of the A. F. of L. of the necessity for bringing the resources of science in every direction to labor's cause. There is need of a general staff to do continuous thinking for labor, trained writers and speakers to interpret the needs and the methods of labor to the general public, and, finally, skilled technicians dealing with special problems. Mr. Gompers will learn that "intellectuals" may have as deep a social sympathy and understanding as men who work at crafts. American labor leaders will learn, as English labor is steadily learning, that one of the banes of our civilization is the cleavage between labor by hand and labor by brain. What the Webbs, R. H. Tawney, Arthur Greenwood, Norman Angell, have brought to the labor movement of England is a contribution and a comradeship that American labor will not very much longer disdain.

3. Through these so-called "intellectuals," working as collaborators with trade unionists, the bridge will be thrown for others to cross. Steadily labor will cease to be essentially a "class" movement of hand workers, and make its broad appeal to the liberal forces of the country.

4. Adverse judicial decisions energized the Labor party of England. The Duplex case and like decisions may accomplish a similar good for this country. Despite his protests Mr. Gompers always has been in politics. But he has been contented to be dependent on legislators who are either indifferent to or ignorant of the fundamental significance of the labor movement. A little more experience with Clayton acts and Duplex decisions may persuade Mr. Gompers that he has been too trusting. Labor *is* in politics of necessity, because industry means politics, industry is the centre of gravity of the modern state. But labor's participation in politics must be continuous and comprehensive, not innocent and impotent.

The New
REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1921, IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC., 421 WEST TWENTY-FIRST STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y. HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT; ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREASURER

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY ALVIN JOHNSON
FRANCIS HACKETT WALTER LIPPMANN
PHILIP LITTELL

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION FIFTY-TWO ISSUES, FIVE DOLLARS IN ADVANCE. SINGLE COPIES FIFTEEN CENTS, CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE. FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR COUNTRIES IN THE POSTAL UNION, SIX DOLLARS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE; REMITTANCE TO BE MADE BY INTERNATIONAL POSTAL MONEY ORDER.

ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Storm-Centre of Reaction

THE outstanding political fact in Hungary today is the imminent return of the monarchy. That, at any rate, is what the politicians, and the gentlemen of the press who play the chorus to them, tell you with surprising frankness. Yet it needs no exceptional skill to discover that the country has something very much more real to worry about than the exact academic formula of her constitution. Hungary is, for all practical purposes, a monarchy at this moment, and not a scrupulously constitutional one either. She needs a king about as badly as a starving man needs a bottle of scent.

For the cities of Hungary, with as rich an agricultural hinterland as any in Europe, are literally starving. How? Because of the Peace; because of the Rumanians; because of the government, because of the peasants, and for a number of other reasons. The Rumanians made, it seems, a very thorough job of it when they sacked the country. They carried off not merely milch-cows and medicines, hospital blankets and plumbing fixtures: they helped themselves to all the food-stuffs they could get their hands on, and as a measure of precaution purely, they took with them the next year's seed-grains as well. That is surely one of the real factors in the present pitiful condition of the people of Budapest and the other large towns. Another is the shortage of coal and wood, which makes the moving of foodstuffs an uncertain undertaking. Much more serious is the circumstance—common to many other countries in Europe now—that the city has nothing to offer in exchange for food, and the peasant rather than make a gift of his potatoes and grain to the town worker feeds them to his pigs. The pigs, at any rate, he can later turn into pork which unlike the national paper money has a value in the world-market. Against the peasant, the existing government of the country is not in the best position to take drastic measures. It was easy for Bela Kun to requisition food from the country, because his support rested on the city proletariat. The government of Count Teleki, in so far as it depends on parliamentary alignments at all, derives authority from a coalition in which the agrarians are the dominant factor. Still, even the present cabinet sees no choice ahead other than starvation of the town or coercion of the country, and Premier Teleki informs me, with a grievous mien, that requisitioning will have to be resorted to,— and soon,— come what may.

The food situation (as well as the housing and the fuel situation) is enormously and tragically complicated by the multitude of refugees that crowd the towns. The refugee is one of the pathetic oversights of the Peace. While some half-measures, I understand, have been adopted by the arbiters of Europe's destiny for the repatriation of soldier-prisoners, the wretched civilian exile has been left to be the foot-ball of all the petty state-lets of central and eastern Europe and the buffer for all their mutual animosities, ancient and modern. He took up his stick and his bundle and began walking in 1914. He has been the vanguard of all the armies of all the wars, Great and Not-So-Great, ever since. He swarms in millions, with his old men and his babies, his women-folk and his sick, into every town and village of Europe that will admit him. He has swelled the population of Budapest from 800,000 to nearly 2,000,000 souls. If he is a Christian his lot is pitiable enough, but if he is a Jew—and a very large percentage of him, of course, is Jewish—it is unspeakable. For one of the achievements of the war to save civilization has been to make millions of Jews exiles in the countries of their birth—I mean, de facto exiles; I know all about the special rights written into the crisp, new constitutions of the brand new republics.

The problem of the refugee is fundamentally a political one, involving as it does the technical questions of status and allegiance on the one hand, and the elementary human right of freedom of movement and residence on the other. It is a European problem, and will eventually have to be taken hold of and solved by Europe cooperatively. What aggravates it, in the meantime, in this country is the political cast of the existing régime, which is really less a government than a punitive expedition. The spirit of vengeance takes itself out on "Bolsheviks"—which means labor organizations and their leaders, non-Magyar refugees, particularly Jewish ones, Jews generally, and all those who are incautious enough to fall into the comprehensive classification of "the economically dangerous to the state."

It is nearly a fortnight now since I have seen some two hundred of these assorted victims in the Schubhaus (police lock-up), and the memory of its frightfulness is as fresh and tormenting as on the day of my visit. It was a bitter cold morning, but the gray stone jail was unheated. The uniformed official who was my guide explained that there was a fuel shortage in the city. I looked about for beds.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Several iron cots bare of all covering were stacked up in the middle of the space. My informant, anticipating a question, volunteered the already well-known fact that the Rumanians had sacked Budapest the year before and had carried off everything. But who were these people, and why were they here? Well, they were alien refugees. They did not belong here. Hungary had enough to do to feed her own poor. The government had warned them that they must leave the country. They had not heeded the warning, and they were merely being detained on their way to internment camps or to deportation. A little girl of seven or eight with a tiny baby in her arms was studying me curiously. I asked her a question in German. She seemed not to understand. I addressed another child—there were between a dozen and a score of them. None of them knew German. Then I made a startling discovery. Seventy-five per cent of the prisoners spoke no other language than Hungarian. The so-called alien refugees were Jewish peasant folk from the lost provinces of Hungary. The majority of them had fled into Budapest when the Russians invaded Hungary in the early days of the war; some of them been living here for twenty years. They had fled for shelter to the capital of their own country in 1914; in 1920 the treaty of peace by a stroke of the pen had converted them into Czechoslovaks, Jugoslavs and Rumanians; and now the government of the only country they have ever known sends gendarmes in the grim hours between midnight and dawn to drag them from their beds like common criminals to the Schubhaus.

Sooner or later the decent opinion of mankind will have to bestir itself about a situation like this which reduces human beings to the level of stray cats and dogs. In justice to Hungary it should be said that what I have just described is not a peculiarly Hungarian condition. It is one of the symptoms of the disease which is eating at the vitals of European society. Philanthropy will not cure such a malady. Yet without the palliative charity (unhappily inadequate) of the Jewish relief societies of America the life of these unfortunates would be intolerable and of very short duration.

The status of the Jews in Hungary is one of the symptoms of the political and economic maladjustment of the country. I believe indeed that the status of minorities in general and the Jews in particular in any country is as accurate a gauge of its forward-going development as can be found. That is why I have paused so long on the subject in a general political article. The heartening promise for the future of Hungary is that anti-semitism has no roots whatever in the mentality of the masses, any more, I am fairly convinced, than monarchy has. Both are confined to small cliques of aristocrats and business-men with an axe to grind, who leave the dirty work to as degenerate-looking a lot of officers as could be collected in Europe.

Interested parties in Budapest, in speaking of the certain restoration of the monarchy, invite your attention to the fact that here are no republicans about. I believe they are right. But when they go on to tell you that, with the exception of the socialists ("whom the Bolshevist adventure has discredited forever") all the political parties are monarchist, I am sure they are wrong. Hungary will doubtless have her king, maybe ere this article is in print. But it will not be because of the ardent wishes of the populace. The populace wants bread and fuel and houses, and, above all things, peace. That is the great tragedy of the defeated countries of central Europe, as well as of some that escaped listing as defeated, that the masses of the people have become politically indifferent. And it is this political indifferentism that I define as reaction. They will accept royalty, or bourgeois democracy, or Bolshevism—anything, so long as it comes without uproar. Perhaps, after all, they will prefer monarchy, since that is the least likely to incur the displeasure of the republican west.

Behind the monarchical mummery there is a lively Schauspiel playing, which has real plot and movement and more than a dash of the good old technique. The other day I was talking to Count Apponyi and I happened casually to ask him who were the claimants to the throne. He straightened up rather dramatically and said: "The crowned king of Hungary lives. The throne has never been vacant." Well, that was impressive. Sentimental, perhaps, but grand. A little later, by way of illustrating the absurdity of the Peace of Trianon, the Count told me this: "My own estate is now in what is called Czechoslovakia. The government there does not allow me to go and see it. Neither do they allow my caretaker to come and see me here. I must meet him in Vienna when I want news of the place." The two observations, coming thus within a few moments of one another, have a symbolic affinity to each other, though I am quite certain Count Apponyi never thought of it.

The restoration of the monarchy, to the unsentimental, does not mean the return of the king merely. It means the reconstitution of the empire, —with this one difference, however, that from now on Hungary is to be the principal state and Budapest the imperial capital. To be sure, this is only one of a dozen schemes, one wilder than the other, that are whispered and laughed at and taken seriously, in a country whose politicians are really concerned with nothing else than the liberation of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lost provinces. But this one is by far the grandest and the most plausible of them all. With Austria now gone white, with Czechoslovakia in constant turmoil, with Rumania corrupt and inefficient, the plan is really promising. Besides, the present arrangements really are economically impossible. Finally and chiefly, France is said to be not unfriendly. No one makes a secret of the opinion that the Disarmament Commission which arrived last week will disarm nobody,—not if the French prevail. The final battle with Bolshevism will come in the spring, and Hungary will be needed to save Poland and democracy. Hungary is more than willing. She is the only country that is willing. She was ready to step in, as is well known, last summer, when much to her disgust the Poles extricated themselves unaided. But in order to help she must have power and resources and moral encouragement. A Roland for an Oliver.

In the meantime light is breaking within the country. In spite of the continuing censorship of the press and the mails, in spite of the continued reign of Horthy's black detachments, in spite of the timidity of liberals and radicals, I believe the power of the terror is waning. The streets are safer at night than they were a week ago, and the censor talks apologetically and calls himself by new names. What has been needed for the past year is that one courageous man should speak out. Last Thursday week Deputy Ruppert supplied that need. In a historic speech in parliament, which he well knew might cost him his life, he boldly reviewed the career of the dictatorship, and in the name of the nation demanded an end to existing abuses. The newspapers carried his utterances in full. The country experienced a thrill. It was but a beginning. Perhaps others will follow.

MILES EVERETT ROSS.

Budapest, Hungary.

When Autumn's Fruit

When Autumn's fruit is packed and stored,
And barns are full of corn and grain;
When leaves come tumbling down to earth,
Shot down by wind or drops of rain:
Then up the road we'll whistling go,
And, with a heart that's merry,
We'll rob the squirrel of a nut,
Or blackbird of a berry.

When Winter's bare and cold for all,
Save lovers with their spawny eyes;
And, like a horse that fleas annoy,
We stamp, to make our spirits rise:
Then out of doors we'll whistling go,
And, with a heart that's merry,
We'll feed—while richer squirrels sleep—
The birds that have no berry.

W. H. DAVIES.

Women in Industry

A REPORT issued not long ago by the new Women's Bureau in the Federal Department of Labor, and called The New Position of Women in American Industry, does really prove that this position is new. The survey on which the report is based was made by the Y. W. C. A. on the understanding that the Women's Bureau would publish the results. The object of the survey was to find out "not only what women in industry in the United States did for the World War but also what the World War did for women in industry."

During the war women had a chance to show what they could do in new and untried occupations. This amazingly complete report, which contains the results of questionnaires in many groups of industries, and specific and unperfunctory testimony from employers, and which records failures as carefully as successes, shows that in the nation as a whole women did their new work exceedingly well. So well—and here we come upon the most important of the facts which the report establishes—that their success has permanently widened the field of women in industry. Industries which formerly employed men chiefly or exclusively are now employing one woman to every nine men. Women have kept their places especially in the machine shop and the tool room. After the armistice there was of course a large general reduction in the number of women workers; but the Women's Bureau shows that in the metal trades, nine months after the armistice, the proportion of women was 191 per thousand workers, as against 178 per thousand just after the second draft. The Bureau cites facts like this as evidence that women workers have made good.

Such detailed proof of success, with all the failures recorded and none evaded, ought to result in giving women workers everywhere in the country a correspondingly greater freedom of choice of occupation. Baseless traditions and prejudices ought not to be rehabilitated. Facts and nothing else should be appealed to in determining which occupations are and which are not "suitable" for women. It is worse than idle to tell a worn-out waitress, who has recovered health and spirits during the war while driving a mail car, that the waitress job is more "suitable."

This insistence on greater freedom of choice for women workers comes at the right moment. Haven't we all taken to thinking of the women-in-industry movement as too exclusively an affair of protective legislation by states, of laws for eight hour days and a minimum wage and the abolition of night work? The Women's Bureau has urged

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and still urges this protective legislation, but it is very much alive to the need of an expansive movement as well. Women workers still find their freedom of choice restricted by hoary prejudice, by an unscientific tradition that certain jobs well within women's physical and other powers are somehow "distinctively men's," by the restriction or non-existence of facilities for trade training and apprenticeship, by the hostility of certain powerful unions toward the admission or training of women workers.

What is the women's point of view? They do not want the nation's attention given wholly to the task of protecting them. Fifteen months ago the International Congress of Working Women at Washington passed a resolution which urged "the prohibition of the employment of women only in trades that *cannot be made* healthy for women as potential mothers." The italics are ours, but the words were very much italicized in the minds of the women who passed the resolution. And now the Women's Bureau, in its present report, shows with careful detail that in some of the occupations opened to women by the war the conditions that traditionally accompany a job were sometimes unsuitable for women when the processes of the job itself were entirely suitable. The report reaches the modest conclusion that perhaps the remedy is not to exclude the women from the occupation but to "exclude" the conditions. Where the reason given for barring women is that the machinery isn't sufficiently safeguarded, why not safeguard the machinery? Five-sixths of the firms that reported to the Bureau upon women in foundries said that the work of women as makers of cores, not only small ones but cores of medium size, was in quality and quantity as good as or better than men's work. The Bureau sets forth that "there is nothing inherently heavy or unhealthy in the making of small cores and much that is attractive." Often, however, the conditions which surround the core-maker are bad. But the badness is not necessary. It can be got rid of. In modern factories, where the core rooms can be cut off the melting and baking rooms, the occupation is quite suitable for women.

Core-making serves to illustrate others among the many adjustments that will have to be made before the old traditions as to what is and what is not women's work can be broken up. Core-making is regarded as a stage in a moulder's apprenticeship, and the constitution of the International Moulders Union of North America provides for the expulsion of any member who gives all or part of his time to the instruction of female help in the foundry or in any branch of the trade. One of the motives behind this provision is a belief that until all stages of apprenticeship are open to women, introduction of women core-makers will complicate and disrupt trade regulations. The same constitution calls for the elimination of such labor "eventually" in all foundries in the name of the "uplifting of humanity." Here the motive is entirely praiseworthy—to keep women out of a hazardous occupation. But how completely the possibility of making it safe for them is ignored!

Part of the work of adjustment will evidently have to be done by the unions. An appendix to The New Position of Women in American Industry gives some interesting lists: Unions that admit women upon the same basis as men; unions that exclude women; unions that admit women upon a basis of reduced dues and reduced benefits. Some union constitutions significantly group "women and apprentices" together.

Another part of the work of adjustment is for the vocational and trade schools. In many communities where women are now a considerable proportion of the labor force in machine shops, furniture plants, etc. the vocational training available for them is still confined to the traditional dress-making, millinery and "home economics." Some of these communities offer men fairly adequate trade courses, based on the community industries, but women are sometimes excluded from these courses, and sometimes they are merely not taken into account. The Women's Bureau urges not that special classes be established for women, but that they be admitted more generally to existing courses. Until this is done, women's opportunities for advancement, in the very trades where they have a footing and have demonstrated their capacity, will remain seriously restricted.

In an earlier report, Women in the Government Service, 1920, the Bureau brought to light some of the quaint anomalies which still exist in practice, and which are due to quaint notions as to what is and what isn't a suitable occupation for women. Women, for instance, may study human diseases and plant diseases, but the Bureau of Animal Industry does not permit them to study animal parasites. Why not? Because, according to the answer given by an official, it ought to be obvious that a bureau which dealt so largely with breeding was no place for ladies. The Navy Department employed both men and women to secure materials and devices that the navy could use, but the Forest Service would not employ women to determine the physical and mechanical properties of wood. Women might study potatoes, but not tobacco. The National Museum would not permit women to classify or catalogue reptiles.

This earlier report of the Bureau's did good. The Federal Civil Service Commission, ten days after the report was presented to it, opened all

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

examinations to both men and women, while leaving the appointing officers free to specify the sex desired. Two weeks later, Senator McLean of Connecticut introduced in the Senate an amendment to the effect that sex shall not be specified unless sex is a physical barrier to the proper performance of the required duties. The new report deals with a wider field than the government service, with the whole field of private industry. In the first half year of its existence as a "permanent" bureau, The Women's Bureau has raised questions which demand wise and fair consideration in the interest of American industry as a whole. It does not confuse the restrictions necessary for the protection of women as potential mothers with the arbitrary and adventitious restrictions that still form a part of our industrial folklore.

ESTHER E. LAPE.

The Fairy Tales of Mr. Chesterton

IT is recorded that Mr. Chesterton once found himself in Lierre at a moment when he and his companion meant to be and supposed they were in Mechlin.

" 'What!' he cried, leaping from his seat, and sending the furniture flying. 'Then all is well, after all. Poetry only hid her face for an instant behind a cloud. Positively for a moment I was feeling depressed because we were in the right town But if we are in the wrong town—why, we have our adventure after all! If we are in the wrong town, we are in the right place. . . . The false optimism, the modern happiness, tires us because it tells us we fit into this world. The true happiness is that we don't fit. We come from somewhere else.' "

Mr. Chesterton's American interviewers should remember these words. If he feels at home in our land let them beware. He will not find this western life either strange or splendid. He will be dreadfully bored. But if by a happy chance the place looks foreign to his very English eyes and he stares about him with a wild surmise, they may take heart. He will tell them gleefully that he is sure he has come to the wrong place. And then Mr. Chesterton's adventures in America will begin.

My own adventures with Mr. Chesterton began many years ago. How we revelled in his new kind of nonsense which had the quality of turning suddenly into the most obvious and necessary sense. Later, we watched him gradually piecing together his bits of philosophy. The paradoxes began to prove themselves not glittering tinsel but stout threads on which a web of argument could be woven. He gave us stories destitute of lovers, wherein ideas were so excitingly dramatized that we forgot or did not mind the fact that the characters were mere puppets. He made us see the meaning of morality in a tale about seven policemen, mistaken by at least one reviewer for a detective story. In his romance about Notting Hill he made us understand the value of beauty without writing a single phrase that was sentimental. He gave us poems; books about Browning and Blake and Dickens; and at last, in 1905 and 1908, he published two remarkable volumes dealing with the Christian apologetic.

It is not likely that this last aspect of his work is very well known among American readers. Our clergy quote him avidly, and his influence may even be felt in the pages of the Atlantic Monthly. But most people probably prefer Father Brown's wisdom to the brilliant chapters of Heretics and Orthodoxy. Nevertheless it is because of his Christianity, because of his championship of the Catholic philosophy, the Catholic way of looking at life, that he challenges our interest and conjecture.

In Mr. Wells's brilliant anonymous review of English literary life which he called Boon, the reader may see Hilaire Belloc and the two Chestertons sitting up all night in a continental train, drinking beer and discussing theology. Now Mr. Belloc is a Roman Catholic by birth and Mr. Cecil Chesterton, who died during the war, was a Roman Catholic by choice. Gilbert, on the contrary, is a member of the extreme Catholic wing of the English Church. He was a speaker at more than one meeting of the Anglo-Catholic Congress which met last summer in London. In this allegiance we shall find the key to one aspect of his character. He believes ardently "in the desirability of an active and imaginative life, picturesque and full of a poetical curiosity." That is why he is an Anglican Catholic.

The religion of the nineteenth century holds no more romantic episode than that which has been called the Oxford Movement. The men who followed Pusey and Newman brought back the poetry, the color and glory of mediaeval catholicism into the dull Erastian life of the English Church. They thought,—good honest men,—that they were doing something very orthodox, very traditional, very patristic even;—and in a sense this was so. They were orthodox, according to the standards of Chrysostom and Augustine, whose words in Latin

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Greek plentifully noted their blue cloth-bound books.

But the average Englishman knew nothing of this antiquarian, imported orthodoxy. He regarded the Puseyites as Romanizers, innovators, traitors to the Establishment. Because of this odd paradox the Oxford Movement came to be a kind of rallying point, not only for the orthodox, but also for men of a more radical turn,—for artists like the pre-Raphaelites, for poets like Christina Rossetti, and finally for romantic adventurers like Gilbert Keith Chesterton. These people announced themselves Catholics because it was not possible to find any more radical, more unusual and individualist thing to do. They wanted to be Catholics because they were liberals, because they were ardent, because they loved color;—not for a moment because they believed in the Pope. They lived in a day when men might be nonconformist or papist without risk of scandal or hazard of fortune. It was no longer possible to be hanged, or even to be cut by one's friends, through professing either of these opinions. But to be a Catholic, and at the same time remain a member of the English Church, this provided and does still provide a man with an amazingly romantic outlook upon the world. He possesses a secret which is at once intimate and cosmic. He belongs to a fraternity which has a capacity for being universal, (if only the Pope would recognize English Orders and the rest of the Empire were converted!) but which is in fact confined to a very few of the elect. In other words, like the heroes of all the fairy tales, he is the one sane man amid a world of lunatics.

This is the secret that lies behind much of Mr. Chesterton's philosophy. He needs "this life of practical romance; the combination of something that is strange with something that is secure." The difficulty about it all is that the security comes from an authority that he denies, namely the Roman authority, while the strangeness arises mainly from the fact that he is really holding a creed which has no inherent authority at all. "I did try," he tells us, "to found a heresy of my own; and when I had put the last touches to it, I discovered that it was orthodoxy." Probably most of us have done the same thing. For what a man really believes must be to him the only orthodoxy.

What then does Mr. Chesterton believe? It would be easier to say what he does not believe. In his thirty odd volumes he has waged unceasing war upon materialism, egoism, socialism, imperialism, eugenics, and all the other modern "masks of tyranny." A wholesome and refreshing atmosphere pervades these books. They provide the Catholic-minded man with a certain fundamental attitude which makes belief easy. The solemn platitudes of the nineteenth century explode and perish at his touch. He, more than any one else, made Queen Victoria begin to look like Mrs. Grundy. But when we seek the writer's own faith, we find ourselves driven by the cracking whip of epigram along the old familiar highroad of orthodox thought. He tells us that "original sin is the only part of Christian theology which can really be proved." We ask, gaspingly, for the proof, and are told that anybody in the street can perceive the fact of the existence of sin. "Who's denying of it?" we cry. Modern people do not deny the existence of sin, but they do deny that the doctrine of the Fall of Man explains sin, still more that it can be proved.

Now the Catholic Philosophy, which on the human side, at least, does start with the doctrine of original sin, is certainly a real philosophy. It has a beginning and a middle and an end, and it can be put in simple words. Most people have no thought-out explanation of the puzzles of human life. The complete answer which this philosophy gives keeps them from seeing that it achieves its perfection, a kind of "spiritual contraction." The combination of "a logical completeness and a spiritual contraction" can be seen in any Roman Catholic text-book.

It is just here that Mr. Chesterton achieves an airy inconsequence. He is not a Roman Catholic. He need not confine himself to that narrow road wherein the Baron von Hügel must walk circumspectly lest he fall into the Index. He can say what he likes. The Catholic Philosophy is what he believes, and into it he may put all his native liberalism, all his enthusiasm for democracy, all his faith in common men. It is an amazingly interesting combination, a thrilling and adventurous experiment, and it constitutes the main attraction of his more serious writings to many people. He is by nature a liberal, a free-thinker, an individualist. But, as he has said,

> I was born when petty poets pule
> When madmen used their liberty to mix
> Lucre and lust, bestial and beautiful.

Mr. Chesterton is never so enchanting as when he is talking the language of fairy tales. In Tremendous Trifles, wherein some of his best work appears, he speaks this language many times. Personally, I do not like to let any Christmas go by without reading The Shop of Ghosts. I wish I might always travel in the spirit of The Ballade of a Strange Town. I look for the day when Broadway shall rise up under my astonished feet and demand justice, as did that London street in A Somewhat Improbable Story. These are all fairy

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tales, and their moral is as obvious as Slovenly Peter and as delightful as Alice in Wonderland.

But when Mr. Chesterton turns and asks us to believe in the facts of the Christian Religion much as we believe in fairy tales, it is hard to take him seriously; indeed it is impossible to take him at all. Consider an example of his own. He says, "we cannot say why an egg can turn into a chicken any more than we can say why a bear could turn into a prince. As *ideas* the egg and the chicken are further off from each other than the bear and the prince: for no egg in itself suggests a chicken, whereas some princes suggest bears." Now, of course, if your only idea of an egg is of something that you find set in the small end of your egg-cup at breakfast, which you proceed to eat along with pepper and salt, and if you have shut your mind to any further understanding of what an egg is, then it never does suggest a chicken. You are like the city child who was horrified at the discovery that milk came, not from nice clean bottles but from country cows. What you need is a new association of ideas. The egg and the chicken are connected by certain vital processes, which you may partly understand. It is possible to call such processes miraculous, but in doing so you are giving a meaning to the word miracle quite different from what it means to the ordinary Christian.

We uncover here Mr. Chesterton's fatal habit of juggling with words. Miracles have always been connected in our minds with that sudden break in an observed sequence which in Scripture and in Catholic tradition have always characterized them. They are a definite departure from the usual natural or vital process. But Mr. Chesterton declares that the miracles and the vital processes are equally miraculous. So indeed they may be. But they no more explain each other than evolution explains the Resurrection.

PETER CONSTABLE.

Lacrimae Rerum

Rossetti walked his sorrow to a field,
Lay in the grass, and watched the wood-spurge flower.
The three-cupped wood-spurge: all that earth would yield
Rosetti to remember of that hour.
He lay with grief, as others too have lain
Who must remember strangely other things.
Things that still keep the contours of their pain,
Whose colors cling longer than sorrow clings.

The tears of things that have not any words,
Deeper than music, stronger than the sea,
And sadder than the flight of homing birds:
Remembered things, outlasting memory.
The shapes of suffering hold, when you and I
And sorrow, and this cause for sorrow, die.

BABETTE DEUTSCH.

Who Is Behind the Open Shop Campaign?

THE October 15, 1920, issue of Industry, the organ interpreting the interests of the National Manufacturers' Association, in an open letter addressed to the members of the American Bankers' Association, stated the purpose of the open shop movement; "to make it possible for each individual worker in the United States to work when he pleases, for whom he pleases, and for what recompense he pleases. In other words, he shall have the right to work or not; limited only by the conditions of employment or lack of employment, which prevail because of economic conditions. The open shop movement is the natural and inevitable American protest against the attempted domination of industry in the United States by any particular class."

On January 12th, 1921, there met in Chicago a convention designed to unite the various forces working for the open shop in the United States. These forces are drawn from the great manufacturing and industrial organizations of the country. The campaign is being directed by the National Association of Manufacturers, the National Iron Erectors' League, and the Associated Industries. An active part in the campaign is being taken by the United States Chamber of Commerce, which in 1919 by 1,664 votes to 4 declared that "the right of open shop operation, that is, the right of employer and employee to enter into and to determine the conditions of employment relations with each other, is an essential part of the individual right of contract possessed by each of the parties." The United States Chamber of Commerce, as its name implies, is composed of local Chambers of Commerce in all parts of the country. The membership includes merchants, bankers, employers, and business men of every degree.

The National Grange, with a membership of nearly 1,000,000 farmers, adopted at its last annual convention a declaration of principles on the right to work, reading as follows: "The National Grange does hereby express its disapproval of any system which denies to any individual the right to work in any place where his industry is needed, at any time and at any wage which is satisfactory to him, or to quit his employment whenever or for whatever reason may be to him controlling, subject only to such contract obligations as he may willingly enter into, and as may be enforceable in an American court of justice."

The Bankers' Association in convention in Washington, D. C., October, 1920, with a membership

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exceeding 23,000 located in every part of the country declared: "Labor, by fomenting strikes, encouraging disagreement with employers, is in fact striking at the heart of its future progress, in impairing the prosperity of the country. . . Every man should be free to work out his own salvation, and not be bound by the shackles of organization to his detriment."

Recently the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce printed in the form of a full page advertisement in the evening papers of that city, the following declaration: "The Cleveland Chamber of Commerce believes in the Open Shop—the real open shop, in which every worker's chance is as good as any other worker's chance." The Milwaukee Employers' Council endorses the following policy: "The Open Shop, a system prevailing in shops, factories, stores, etc., under which men and women are employed on a basis of ability and honesty without regard to their affiliations, religions, political, union or otherwise." In Toledo, the Manufacturers' and Merchants' Association declares: "We stand for the open shop." In Paterson, New Jersey, the Associated Industries of that city published in the press the following typical statement: "We pledge ourselves to hire any worthy worker we can, absolutely without discrimination, who belongs to a trade union. We also pledge ourselves to hire any worthy worker we can, absolutely without discrimination, who is an independent working man."

The National Association of Manufacturers, which is leading the fight, is the "largest and strongest trade organization in the world,—when one considers capital invested, hands employed or output." (Extracts from circulars issued by the National Association of Manufacturers.*) "The Association concerns itself with national and state legislation, publicly and powerfully if required, secretly and just as powerfully if that seems best. It knows what its own members and all manufacturers desire; it knows what they want antagonized. It pushes wise legislation; it defeats unwise legislation.'" It is asserted that the individual members of this organization employ more than 8,000,000 persons and represent an approximate capital of $15,000,000,000. The National Association of Manufacturers is issuing tons of literature dealing with the subject of the open shop, all of which is distributed to the industrialists and manufacturers of America.

Another organization which plays an active part in the campaign, is the Associated Employers of Indianapolis, Indiana. Its aims (quoting from Industry of October, 1920) are typical of those of the most progressive of the associations of the United States devoted to promoting the American plan in employment relations. They are "to invoke industrial and commercial harmony and democracy on an economic basis that is just and fair to both employer and employee and to the general public. To insist through concerted action upon orderly government to the end that ambition and initiative on the part of both business men and wage earners may be stimulated and protected to their mutual advantage and the successful development and operation of the city's business institutions may be assured through sane and constructive enactments, and their impartial enforcement. In short, on behalf of both employer and employee to defend the industrial and commercial life of Indianapolis against the encroachments of its enemies, whether from within or without." Industry of the same date, states "The declaration of principles adopted by the Associated Employers of Indianapolis is indicative of the constructive spirit animating the entire open shop movement." The Indianapolis Association declares itself "unalterably opposed to the principles of the closed shop. It is un-American, illegal, and unfair to the independent workingmen who do not desire to join a union; to the employer who prefers to operate an open shop, and to the public."

The Iowa Manufacturers' Association adopted resolutions on the open shop, the second of which is, "That we will not negotiate with any workers out on a strike."

A few of the other great industrial organizations taking a lively interest in the campaign are the National Founders' Association, the National Metal Trades Association, and the League for Industrial Rights.

The National Founders' Association has been in existence for nearly forty years, and includes most of the foundries east of the Rocky Mountains. Industry in its issue of February 15, 1920, gives as the original purpose for which the association was organized "to provide machinery for bargaining collectively with the Iron Moulders' Union." Since 1904, the association has declared for the open shop.

The National Metal Trades Association has never receded from the position that "it is the right of every workingman to earn a livelihood in the shops of its members without the necessity of first obtaining the permission of organized labor to do so." The association objects to such "vicious principles of trade unions as the closed shop."

The League for Industrial Rights claims to be "the liberal wing of the employers movement." "Perhaps it is not unfair to say," writes Industry of November 15, 1919, "that it is the original

*Quoted by Adams and Sumner, Labor Problems, page 273.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

anti-Bolshevik movement." Among the celebrated cases conducted by this organization were the Danbury Hatters' Case, and the Bucks Stove Range Co. Case. "In these days of class conflict, when the temptation is keen to make the government a tool for selfish class purpose" (Industry of the same date) the league has set for itself the important duty of urging the enactment of various laws to "maintain the supremacy of the government, and to protect the interests of society." Industry assures us that the League does not desire to remain purely a defensive organization, but seeks to promote a liberal attitude along lines which are truly constructive. Apparently this constructive policy consists in the fight against organized labor.

The organization which claims to express an authoritative scientific opinion for the industrial organizations of America, is the National Industrial Conference Board. It was founded in 1916, and is a federation of national associations of manufacturers in the principal branches of American industry. Among the objects of the board are "to promote an understanding and satisfactory relations between employers and employees, as an essential basis for the conduct of industry and the welfare of the nation." Another one of its aims is to command the attention of the government when formulating industrial legislation and policies.

In order to cover the press to a nation-wide extent an American press bureau has been established. Thomas J. Sullivan, the director of publicity for the bureau, declared to a United Press representative on November 26, 1920, that his bureau is not opposed to organized labor, but is against the closed shop. He further declared that more than 1,200 Chambers of Commerce over the country have gone on record as favoring the open shop. The business of this bureau Mr. Sullivan is quoted as saying is to distribute to newspapers and magazines all over the country propaganda advocating the open shop, the cost to be borne by the manufacturers. The organizations here enumerated, with one exception, as backing the open shop campaign, have done so for the last twenty years. The one organization which in the past has claimed to be an institution for education and omitted from its field any propaganda, is the United States Chamber of Commerce. This organization has made a change in policy by putting into a prominent position Mr. Frederick J. Koster, former president of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, who played an important role in the fight against Trade Unionism in San Francisco.

The "nation-wide" open-shop campaign is not a conspiracy. It is not a mere spontaneous upspringing of sentiment in a hundred industrial centres. It is the expression of a long-held purpose of many organizations. And the expression becomes clear and even vociferous because the time is favorable for the business group to speak.

In a time of war-weariness, and of high prices, the "general public" is ready to make a scapegoat of any easy victim. The business group in America feel themselves in a position to manipulate this fatigue and irritation of the average citizen aganst organized labor.

SAVEL ZIMAND.

On Safeguarding Maternity

THERE are two serious losses of human life which the public health movement of the last fifty years has not yet brought under control. The first affects mothers in childbirth and the second infants at birth and during the first month after birth. In the United States, there are approximately seventeen thousand maternal deaths annually and about one hundred thousand stillbirths and as many deaths of infants under one month old. Both of these losses strike at the very foundation of society. For, probably, no single group of persons is of greater social and economic value to the state than the young mothers. The infants are the productive citizens of the next generation. It is an amazing fact that the high death rate of mothers and babies has stayed very much the same during the period that has seen the almost complete control of the great epidemic diseases, such as smallpox, yellow fever and cholera; the reduction of two-thirds of the deaths from typhoid fever; and the cutting in two of the tuberculosis death rate. Taken by and large, it is as dangerous for our wives to bear children today as it was for our grandmothers, and it is just as hazardous for our infants to be born alive and survive the first month as it was in the days of our fathers.

The difficulty seems to be the undeveloped state of obstetrics in most countries. This branch of medicine has been aptly called the Cinderella of the medical sciences. Very little provision is still made in our medical schools for the training of the army of new doctors in what is an important part of their medical work, namely, the care of women in pregnancy and childbirth. The physicians who are well-established in the community do not like obstetrical practice and those who are making their reputation are, for the most part, unprepared to do it well. Much of the work, therefore, falls to midwives and, in some parts of the country, as in the South, and especially among the colored people, midwifery is often in the hands of ignorant old women who are utterly untrained in the difficult requirements of modern obstetrical service. The

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

aseptic handling of mother and baby under such conditions is out of the question. Midwives, except where they are supervised and instructed by the Department of Health as is done in New York City, are notoriously unprepared to meet the difficulties which so often accompany the puerperium. They take chances and the death of mother and baby is not an uncommon result. Even in New York City, with its splendid medical facilities and with its large expenditures for public health, one woman still dies out of approximately every two hundred confinements. No one knows how many more are impaired as the result of neglected pregnancies and badly supervised confinements. In this same city, about eight per cent of the infants brought to term are either born dead or die before they are a month old. In other communities, large and small, where facilities are not as well-developed as they are in New York City, conditions are, of course, worse.

It is then with the purpose of meeting this situation that there has sprung up in a number of cities of the United States a movement for the safeguarding of maternity. The cities of Boston, New York and Los Angeles, to quote a few of the leaders, have done well in this line of activity. Especially significant is the work of the Maternity Centre Association in New York City which has made a splendid demonstration of how unnecessary is the usual waste of mothers and babies. In 1920 this Association, cooperating with doctors, medical hospitals and nurses of other organizations cared for over ten thousand women. A careful study of the records of close to five thousand cases which had received adequate care during pregnancy, at confinement and for one month afterward, showed that two-thirds of the deaths which might be expected to occur among the women and that one-half of the infant deaths and of the stillbirths could be prevented. A work that does that in the face of the general pessimism which has for years bemoaned our inability to cope with such losses is worthy of support. The demonstration means much not only to New York, not only to the country at large, but to the civilized world; for the heavy toll of deaths of women and of infants is universal and the public must learn that a new way of meeting the difficulties of the situation has been discovered.

In its essence, the work of the Maternity Centres consists in interesting women early in their pregnancy to take advantage of the medical and nursing facilities of such centres. Such women are visited by nurses and receive instruction in the hygiene of pregnancy; are guided in making the best possible arrangements for their confinement; are encouraged to come to the doctor's clinic for examination if not already under medical supervision and are constantly watched for the appearance of any symptom which may in any way indicate abnormality and danger. As the work goes on and is better understood by the physicians and nurses who are engaged in it, a uniform standard is being developed and the ultimate result will therefore be even better. It is hoped that before long it may be shown that only very rarely need a woman pay the penalty with her life for her courage in assuming the duty of maternity.

What is done by such voluntary agencies as the Maternity Centre Association of New York City and the Instructive District Nursing Association of Boston for a fortunate few of the population should be made available to the entire maternal population of the country. The time is past when there can be any further question of the desirability of such extension of maternal care. The logical arrangement would seem to be for health departments of the states and cities supported by taxation, to assume this activity as one of their regular functions. There will always be those who can afford and will obtain such service through physicians in the field of private practice. But, for the great mass of women, the only solution in sight would appear to be the development of agencies within the departments of health to offer such service widely and efficiently. This is the ideal and to those who are engaged in this sort of work, it is an ideal which is still very distant of attainment. During the interim, the work must be supported privately as is being done in the cities quoted. No time should be lost in educating communities, first, in the losses they now suffer, second, how completely these losses may be controlled; third, the need for supporting the work which will make childbearing safe.

LOUIS I. DUBLIN.

Penreb's Tomb

"Upon these stones Time broke his teeth," you said.
We stood in Penreb's tomb, and stared upon
The hammered blocks that held the royal dead
Whose pomp still stood, altho his breath was gone.
You said, "Slaves sweated for that narrow room."
Their scattered bones are mixed with desert sand;
But on the high walls, ruddy in the gloom,
The files of the king's servitors yet stand.

We shall not rear to death such monuments
With massive marble, nor with crimson chalk.
Nor wrap our withered limbs in cerements
More spicy than our rare ephemeral talk.
So Time, who broke his teeth upon these stones,
Gnaws at our hearts, careless of Penreb's bones.

BABETTE DEUTSCH.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Freedom of Speech and States Rights

DURING the early years of the American Revolution several states felt the need of protecting Congress and flag against the Tory wit who asserted that Martha Washington had a yellow tom-cat with thirteen black stripes around his tail, which suggested to her the design for the flag. Massachusetts accordingly passed a law fining any person who used expressions "in preaching or praying, or in public or private discourse or conversation, with an apparent design to discourage" people from supporting independence. Virginia had a similar statute, which came home to roost when that commonwealth denounced the Sedition act of 1798 as a violation of freedom of speech. But state action was never used to curb opposition to subsequent wars, until 1917. It remained for our own day, when the doctrine of states' rights was supposed to be on its last legs, to establish by the Supreme Court decision in Gilbert v. Minnesota that the weapons which Massachusetts and Virginia used against the disloyal remain sharp and active in the hands of modern state governments and were not surrendered to the nation in 1787.

I.

It is significant evidence of the altered attitudes of Americans toward open discussion that during the recent war eleven states and territories considered even the unprecendented severity of the federal Espionage act of 1917 an insufficient protection against pamphlets and oratory, and supplemented it by drastic local legislation. Thus Montana imposed a penalty of twenty years in prison for various insults to the Constitution, the uniform, and the flag, which were considered too trivial to be federal crimes, until Congress in 1918 inserted the whole Montana law into the middle of the Espionage act. Nothing could show better the way state war legislation works than the fate of Starr of Montana, as described by a United States Judge. (See 263 Federal Reporter 145.) "He was in the hands of one of those too common mobs, bent upon vindicating its peculiar standards of patriotism and its odd concept of respect for the flag by compelling him to kiss the latter." In the excitement of resisting their efforts, Starr said: "What is this thing anyway? Nothing but a piece of cotton with a little paint on it and some other marks in the corner there. I will not kiss that thing. It might be covered with microbes." The state authorities did absolutely nothing to the mob, but they had Starr convicted under the Montana Sedition act for using language "calculated to bring the flag into contempt and disrepute," and sentenced him to the penitentiary for not less than ten nor more than twenty years at hard labor.

The right of the states to enact and enforce such legislation has now been vindicated by the Supreme Court in the case of the Minnesota statute (Laws, 1917, c. 463). This was enacted right after we entered the war, before Congress passed either the Draft or Espionage acts. It made it unlawful to advocate by writing, print, or public talking, "that men should not enlist in the military or naval forces of the United States or the state of Minnesota," or "that citizens of this state should not aid or assist the United States in prosecuting or carrying on war with the public enemies of the United States." Any violator could be arrested without warrant, fined $100 to $500, and imprisoned three months to a year. These penalties, though enough to deter all but the most militant pacifists, are unusually light for a war statute; but in 1919 Minnesota, eager to be ready for our next war, substituted a far more sweeping law of the Montana type, imposing the maximum penalty of twenty years in the penitentiary without which no American sedition statute can be thought up-to-date.

The 1917 law, which alone concerns us, atoned for its want of severity by numerousness of prosecutions. On its face it seems directed against the comparatively few men who urge prospective volunteers, "Don't enlist," and actually propose resistance to the draft and other war laws. Not one such case appears among the seventeen prosecutions in the Minnesota Reports. The statute was used to reach a very different kind of language. These decisions, like the Espionage act cases, pound home the truth so easily overlooked by high-minded advocates of a sedition law, that you never can tell from reading the law when enacted what sort of speeches and pamphlets will be suppressed by it six months later.

The courts held that this statute could be violated although not a single person was dissuaded from enlisting, without a word about enlisting, and even though the jury found and believed that the speaker had not the slightest intention of hindering enlistment or any other war service. It was enough for a conviction, if "the natural and reasonable effect of the statements uttered was to deter those to whom they were made" from enlisting or giving aid in the war. Of course any discussion opposing our entry into the war would easily have this effect, and also,—what was more objectionable to the ruling powers of Minnesota,—any bitter criticism, even by a man who favored the war, directed against the actual war methods of the federal government and of the official and unofficial persons who managed the war activities of Minnesota.

It is impossible to understand the operation of this statute and of the vague test of guilt laid down by the courts without some mention of the Minnesota conditions which lay behind every prosecution and every verdict. The presence of a large number of farmers of German birth was part of the trouble, but a still more important factor is summarized by an acute and trustworthy observer, John Lord O'Brian, who as Assistant to Attorney General Gregory directed the enforcement of the Espionage act (42 Rep. N. Y. St. Bar Ass'n. 297):

> The general condition in the grain-producing states was intensified by the traditional hostility of the farmer toward the commercial interests of the cities,—a phase of agrarian discontent usually summed up in the claim that the townsmen profited unjustly at the expense of the consumers. This steadily showed itself in many rural districts in a form of hostility toward state, county and local councils of defense, which it was claimed, were usually dominated by business men, the boards of trade, commercial clubs, etc.

The situation described in the Atlantic Monthly under the title, Prussianizing Wisconsin, was not peculiar to Wisconsin. Much resentment must have been caused in some parts of Minnesota by Liberty Bond committees who forced everyone to file a complete inventory of his real and personal property, on the basis of which the committee, consisting partly of bankers, required him to buy bonds to an

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

amount that necessitated his borrowing from these same bankers at an interest-rate which from the very outset was considerably higher than yielded by the coupons on the bonds. The hostility caused by such methods evoked sharp comments, which those in control were not reluctant to silence.

Finally, the long-standing antagonism between farmers and business men had recently been crystallized by the formation of the Nonpartisan League. Whole counties were divided into Leaguers and opponents with no neutrals, and the belief of these opponents in the seditious nature of the League was so strong that almost any public discussion of the war by a League member would lead to his conviction by a jury, which, naturally enough, would not contain members of the League.

It followed from these conditions that practically every speech or pamphlet prosecuted, instead of dealing with enlistment, was an expression of this hostility to "big business" or an exposition of the economic views of the League in such sentences as,—"This war was arbitrarily declared against the will of the people to protect the investments of Wall Street in the bonds of the Allies." "It is an insult to the American farmer to ask him to raise more grain and then take our boys and send them over there." One man was convicted for saying that he agreed with the speech just delivered by Gilbert (quoted below), and another for the remark, "No soldier ever sees those socks." These convictions were sustained on appeal, but those that were reversed as erroneous after the armistice had an equally terrorizing effect during the war, and show how such a statute may be used to stifle personal liberty. One such conviction was for a criticism of the food at a training camp; another for a statement to a Red Cross committee which visited a farmer at his house to solicit funds, that the government which had got us into an unnecessary war could get us out of it, and ought to supply the Red Cross by direct taxation instead of always sending men to ask for money. In addition to those cases, an attempt was made to have the whole War Program of the League declared criminal, but without success.

II.

From this background, familiar to many of us in the pages of Main Street, the scene shifts to Washington. Gilbert, a Nonpartisan leader, was indicted and convicted for the following words in a speech:

> We are going over to Europe to make the world safe for democracy, but I tell you we had better make America safe for democracy first. You say, what is the matter with our democracy. I tell you what is the matter with it: Have you had anything to say as to who should be President? Have you had anything to say as to who should be Governor of this state? Have you had anything to say as to whether we would go into this war? You know you have not. If this is such a good democracy, for Heaven's sake why should we not vote on conscription of men? We were stampeded into this war by newspaper rot to pull England's chestnuts out of the fire for her. I tell you if they conscripted wealth like they have conscripted men, this war would not last over forty-eight hours.

This language should be compared with the terms of the Minnesota statute as a demonstration of sedition law construction. The conviction was sustained by the United States Supreme Court, the Chief Justice and Justice Brandeis dissenting. Justice McKenna delivered the opinion of the Court, but Justice Holmes concurred only in the result and not in the reasons. The dissenting judges based their objections to the constitutionality of the statute on two distinct grounds. Chief Justice White was of the opinion that the subject matter of the statute, viz., interference with enlistment, is within the exclusive legislative power of Congress, when exerted, and that the action of Congress in passing the Espionage act has occupied the whole field, leaving no room for state action. Justice Brandeis took a somewhat similar position, and also held the statute a violation of freedom of speech.

(1) May a state constitutionally punish opposition to war, especially if Congress legislates on the subject? Justice McKenna answered that Congress alone can raise armies, but the states as well as the nation are intimately concerned in the outcome of the war. They must have power of cooperation against the enemies of all.

> Whether to victory or defeat depends upon their morale, the spirit and determination that animates them —whether it is repellant and adverse or eager and militant, and to maintain it eager and militant against attempts at its debasement in aid of enemies of the United States, is a service of patriotism, and from the contention that it encroaches upon or usurps any power of Congress, there is an instinctive and immediate revolt.

Justice Brandeis, on the other hand, maintained that the nation alone can limit discussion about the army and war. Even though the majority deny that this is required by the Constitution, the stubborn fact remains that it is the only sound policy. The undesirability of state war statutes is far more important than their unconstitutionality. The federal government has exclusive control over enlistments and the sole responsibility for the conduct of a war. When it determines that a man should not enter the army without the fullest consideration from every point of view of the consequences of his action, or when it decides to allow a fairly wide range of discussion to the opponents of a war either as a safety valve for discontent or for the sake of obtaining the advantage of their opinions, such national policies will be very seriously blocked if the various states see fit to run amuck and establish inconsistent limitations on discussion. These limitations will be enforced in the heated atmosphere of local fears and dissensions, and opinions will be suppressed which the nation thinks it wise to leave alone. If there is ever a time that the nation ought to act as a unit it is in war. It is strange indeed that a Court which has lately decided that the regulation of workmen's compensation for accidents on vessels in a state harbor can not be entrusted by Congress to the state legislature but must be uniformly fixed for the nation as a whole, should have allowed a state to limit war-time discussion in any way it pleased, regardless of the declared wishes of Congress.

The injurious effects of state war laws upon a national policy toward such discussion are not a matter of conjecture. We know from Mr. O'Brian that the Minnesota policy was absolutely at variance with the national policy and proved a cause of real embarrassment and danger to the federal government:

> Without entering into the discussion as to the loyalty or disloyalty of some of the early leaders of the Nonpartisan League, it would be unjust to question the patriotism or honesty of the great mass of its membership. . . . The Attorney General (Gregory) adhered to the policy that the Federal Law Department would

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

insist upon the fundamental doctrine that guilt was personal and would not lend itself to proscribing any class of individuals as a class . . . In the state of Minnesota, because of what was claimed to be either inadequate federal law or federal administration, state laws of a sweeping character were passed and enforced with severity. Whether justified or not in adopting this policy of repression, the result of its adoption increased discontent and the most serious cases of alleged interference with civil liberty were reported to the federal government from that state.

If the war had lasted another year with uncertain prospects of victory, the continuance of this Minnesota policy might easily have embittered great masses of farmers and seriously hampered the production of grain and other war essentials.

(2) The free speech point in Gilbert v. Minnesota involves a preliminary question. Has the United States Supreme Court any power to reverse a state conviction because it unduly restricts freedom of speech? This power can not arise from the first amendment, which limits only federal action. Since all the cases in which the question has been raised have held that there was no improper restriction in the particular facts, they have been willing to assume the existence of this power for the sake of argument. This is Justice McKenna's position. Justice Brandeis, however, states very interesting reasons for the proposition that freedom to discuss national affairs is one of the "privileges or immunities" of citizens of the United States, which, under Article IV, Section 2, and the fourteenth amendment, no state can abridge:

> The right of a citizen of the United States to take part, for his own or the country's benefit, in the making of federal laws and in the conduct of the government, necessarily includes the right to speak or write about them; to endeavor to make his own opinion concerning laws existing or contemplated prevail; and, to this end, to teach the truth as he sees it. Were this not so, the right of the people to assemble for the purpose of petitioning Congress for a redress of grievances or for anything else connected with the powers or duties of the national government would be a right totally without substance. Full and free exercise of this right by the citizen is ordinarily also his duty; for its exercise is more important to the nation than it is to himself. Like the course of the heavenly bodies, harmony in national life is a resultant of the struggle between contending forces. In frank expression of conflicting opinion lies the greatest promise of wisdom in government; and in suppression lies ordinarily the greatest peril.

And then he states the principles which ought to govern when suppression becomes necessary:

> There are times when those charged with the responsibility of government, faced with clear and present danger, may conclude that suppression of divergent opinion is imperative; because the emergency does not permit reliance upon the slower conquest of error by truth. And in such emergencies the power to suppress exists. But the responsibility for the maintenance of the army and navy, for the conduct of war and for the preservation of government, both state and federal, from 'malice domestic and foreign levy' rests upon Congress . . . . Congress, being charged with responsibility for those functions of government, must determine whether a paramount interest of the nation demands that free discussion in relation to them should be curtailed. No state may trench upon its province.

Justice Brandeis also suggests the possibility that liberty of speech is one type of "liberty" of which under another clause of the fourteenth amendment no person can be deprived without due process of law:

> I have difficulty in believing that the liberty guaranteed by the Constitution, which has been held to protect against state denial the right of an employer to discriminate against a workman because he is a member of a trade union, the right of a business man to conduct a private employment agency, or to contract outside the state for insurance of his property, although the legislature deems it inimical to the public welfare, does not include liberty to teach, either in the privacy of the home or publicly, the doctrine of pacifism; so long, at least, as Congress has not declared that the public safety demands its suppression. I cannot believe that the liberty guaranteed by the fourteenth amendment includes only liberty to acquire and to enjoy property.

In view of the test of freedom of speech declared by the unanimous opinion of the Supreme Court in the Schenck case, it would seem clear that Gilbert was improperly convicted, since the Minnesota statute requires no clear and present danger of interference with enlistment as a basis of guilt, nor did his speech create such a danger. Nevertheless, the majority through Justice McKenna hold that even if freedom of speech can not be wiped out by state action, it can be limited, and that a limitation was proper in this case:

> Gilbert's speech had the purpose they (the words of the Minnesota statute) denounce. The nation was at war with Germany, armies were recruiting, and the speech was the discouragement of that—its purpose was necessarily the discouragement of that. It was not an advocacy of policies or a censure of actions that a citizen had a right to make. The war was flagrant; it had been declared by the power constituted by the Constitution to declare it, and in the manner provided for by the Constitution. It was not declared in aggression, but in defense, in defense of our national honor, in vindication of the 'most sacred rights of our nation and our people.'
>
> This was known to Gilbert for he was informed in affairs and the operations of the government, and every word that he uttered in denunciation of the war was false, was deliberate misrepresentation of the motives which impelled it, and the objects for which it was prosecuted. He could have had no purpose other than that of which he was charged. It would be a travesty on the constitutional privilege he invokes to assign him its protection.

I would ask the reader to turn back once more to the speech on which Justice McKenna is commenting. Few of us would regard Gilbert as a sound exponent of all the motives which led us into war, but how many American citizens two years after the armistice, knowing all they do about the dissensions at Versailles, about the British appropriation of Mesopotamian oil, about the defaulted interest on the American loans to our Allies, about the Republican National Convention of 1920, would describe that speech in the language of Justice McKenna? The experts on poison gas tell us that after the wind has swept it away from the levels of the battle-field, it still lurks for long in a few holes and crevices. Similar properties are apparently possessed by war emotion.

It is to be hoped that Gilbert v. Minnesota is the last decision of the Supreme Court on freedom of speech for

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

some time to come. The test of "clear and present danger," announced by a unanimous Court in the Schenck case, has since been more honored in the breach than in the observance, but as yet it has not been expressly rejected, and it still stands as a landmark to which we may hold fast in future. Nevertheless, the war teaches the lesson that final limits upon governmental power over discussion, though they have a real value for charging juries and setting aside verdicts, are of comparatively small service in the almost total absence from the national consciousness of any genuine belief in the usefulness of the open expression of unpopular ideas. President Wilson is a lover of Bagehot, but very little has been seen during the last administration of Bagehot's conviction of the value of toleration. Even tolerant officials administering the Espionage act were continually hampered by the insistence of the people that conspicuous pro-Germans, pacifists, and socialists be prosecuted, —otherwise they would be lynched. Those who still share Milton's confidence in the power of truth unguarded by sedition laws—"Let her and Falsehood grapple; who ever knew Truth put to the worse, in a free and open encounter?"—can best prepare for the next emergency by spreading the principles of the Areopagitica and Mill's Liberty of Thought through the minds of the American people.

ZECHARIAH CHAFEE, JR.

CORRESPONDENCE

Miss Cromwell's Poems

SIR: From time to time, since the award of the Poetry Society was published, readers of magazines devoted to poetry must have noted references to the society's prize of $500 for the best volume of verse written by an American citizen and published in 1919. An analysis of the votes made it appear that there was a tie between two volumes—between A Song of Three Friends by John G. Neihardt, and Poems by Gladys Cromwell. "But since Miss Cromwell was not living," the Poetry Society's bulletin announced, "the money award was given entirely to Mr. Neihardt."

The credit given to a posthumous book may easily be lost sight of. For that reason I think it right to emphasize the fact that the giving of the money award does not place A Song of Three Friends any higher than the Poems of Gladys Cromwell, a book that has often been singled out for commendation for its high excellence.

PADRAIC COLUM.

New York City.

From the Danish

SIR: I've got something a bit on my mind. Maybe that doesn't concern you. Still a Journal of Opinion may be interested in an honest opinion which seems to be very infrequently expressed, though probably it is one held by a considerable number of people in this country.

Nothing seems to enrage our critics, or rather reviewers, of the strong-arm type so much as what they call with so unctuous a scorn the "Puritanism" of America. Some of them have been driven nearly mad by their contempt for this for so many years that the exercise of their caustic denunciation of the awful thing seems to have become a regular profession with them. And whenever any reviewer gets into a toploftical frame of mind and feels disposed to pull the "virile" stuff this old bugbear is always the readiest thing to his hand. It has been done so often that certainly it ought to be an easy enough thing to do. One might think that at length we'd get shamed out of, or scared out of, our "prudery." Apparently, however, not. Our own peculiar conventions as to morals and manners in literature continue to persist, and appear likely to endure as long as the character of the nation. That is, until such happy time as we are completely Europeanized.

What has here set me off on these amiable reflections is this: In the issue of The New Republic for December 22nd appeared a review headed The Mutilation of a Masterpiece. The article ran to something like a page and a half. It was devoted to the English version of Martin Andersen Nexö's novel translated under the title: Ditte: Girl Alive. It appears (in this review) that the translation is what Mr. Whistler would have called "a monstrous lampoon." It is a "caricature" of the work of the "continental" author—a piece of "malpractice." And a particularly diabolical one. The American publishers, the writer very strongly intimates, ought to be arrested and hanged, or something. As for the criminality of the American publishers, I can state on complete authority that the book came to them in its English translation from the London publishers. They were not aware how London had deliberately prepared the book for the market of the Middle West. Perhaps they should have got hold of the original text and fixed the book up again for a purely continental audience. Maybe they are sorry now they didn't.

Still I don't know that to have done this would have served Danish literature in the United States. The reviewer, Signe Toksvig, says (amid a whole lot more to precisely the same effect):

"He (the author) doesn't make use of dialect or forced quaintness, he depends, if one may say so, on never getting out of the picture. He never uses a learned or a literary word. He hardly ever uses a word that his fishers and farmers wouldn't understand, or themselves use. Therefore, besides the beauty of simple peasant language, his book has also its unashamedness, its impolite realism in discussing natural functions. And here, of course, is where the Anglo-American translator and publisher step in with their pruning hooks."

It might be argued (by a Philistine, of course—a person who spells his name in some such way as I do mine) that Danish fishers and farmers did not stand in need of a translation of their own simple peasant language; that most American readers did; and that a translation which does not flatly repel them is more effective as an introduction to the work of the Danish author than one which would.

Our reviewer deplores particularly the omission in the translation of the reference in the original text to the fact that babies are inclined to wet themselves. Perhaps this is a lure to those of continental taste among us to take up the study of the Danish language.

ROBERT CORTES HOLLIDAY.

New York City.

[The review which Mr. Holliday criticizes did not say a word about Puritanism. It said that in common honesty Henry Holt & Co., Mr. Holliday's firm, should omit Nexö's name from a version of his novel Ditte Menneskebarn that falsified, prettified and also mistranslated the original. This is the real issue and Mr. Holliday has not met it. The fact that the translation was imported from England does not exonerate a responsible publisher. Neither does it exonerate the publisher to refer facetiously to "continental taste" and "our own peculiar conventions." If "continental taste" is not the liking of Mr. Holliday's firm, why does it publish Nexö? But if a book is to be published, surely the public should be let judge for itself in regard to the text.—THE REVIEWER.]

Japan and Emigration

SIR: I assume that you are more interested in giving your readers exact information than in maintaining your own infallibility, and am therefore going to make some criticisms of your article Must The Japanese Emigrate? I am heartily in sympathy with the spirit of the tract, and, with but two or three exceptions (which I shall point to below) cannot question your facts. It is rather in the spirit of one trying to throw more light on what you say that I write.

I wish to take exception to your statement that "There is no question about the adequacy, both in point of quantity and quality, of the Japanese labor supply." In neither quantity nor quality does Japan possess "The chief prerequisites to a development of expert industries." I have listened to the complaints of both Japanese and foreigners in Japan too long to accept that.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Just the other day, a representative of one of Japan's largest newspapers came to see me, and in our conversation he said that Japan could not hope to compete with the west as yet, because she had not the engineers, the chemists, the skilled workmen with which alone a nation can arrive at industrial equality with other nations. And I would be further borne out by the report of the British vice-consul at Osaka, Japan. Admitting that external conditions have much to do with the poor quality of the Japanese workman, and that in time and under better conditions he will improve, the vice-consul says: "The standard (of intelligence) shown by the average workman is admittedly low" while some of his sub-captions are: "Docility," "Apathy," "Cheerfulness," "Lack of Concentration," "Scarcity of Skilled Labor," and further, under the caption: "Why Wages Are Low" he says: "Labor is plentiful and inefficient."

Yet, as to its quantity, Japanese manufacturers find the more numerous and more docile Koreans and Chinese, whose standard of living is unfortunately even lower than that of the Japanese, a richer field in which to work than in Japan, where there is not enough ready skilled labor to carry on. I say this, relatively speaking.

I have not the figures at hand, but my recollection is that Japan obtains only some 15,000,000 tons of coal a year from her own fields. And so meagre, indeed, is the supply, that it is not expected to last many years. Japan's hope lies in the coal of Shan-si, which could supply the whole world for a thousand years, according to experts.

I also think it dangerous to make too hasty conclusions with regard to Japan's love of force. Japan has indeed taken her cue from Germany, but not in the manner you would have us believe,—not merely as a theory which she borrowed and wished to apply. Rather, because force has been the only method Japan has known and applied at home, and (before her two and a half centuries of seclusion) abroad, because it is inherent in the nature of the rulers of Japan and synonymous with the spirit of the Samurai, did Japan so readily adopt Germany's theory of force.

I fully agree that Japan can solve her problem of population only by industrialization, and not by emigration, as I have constantly pointed out in the newspapers and magazines, and wish most sincerely that that were quick in being accomplished. My reason for calling attention to these points is only in the desire that through greater knowledge of actual conditions, the improvement of the conditions of the Japanese people might be hurried on. But knowing what the conditions are, from years of contact with the Japanese, and being aware of the eagerness of the leaders of Japan for not always unselfish nor peaceful self-aggrandisement, I cannot altogether share with you the faith that "Japan has no real conflict of interest with the western Powers out of which wars might be expected to spring." Were Japan more evenly matched with western Powers industrially, she would not be so ruthless as she has been in Korea, Manchuria, China and Siberia in her endeavor to exclude wherever exclusion is possible.

SYDNEY GREENBIE.

New York City.

The Meaning of "Buckra"

SIR: In the article Elected by Terror in Florida by Mr. Walter F. White in your issue of January 12th, after the word "buckra" there is in parenthesis—"poor white people." I do not think that in any dictionary will the meaning of buckra be found as "poor white man." It seems to have been originally used by the natives on the African coast and in the West Indies as meaning a demon or superior being and was afterwards applied to white men. In the South and especially in South Carolina where I lived and came in contact with all classes of people it was looked upon as Negro dialect and was used only by Negroes. I never heard a white man use it in reference to another white man unless he was repeating a conversation of a Negro. In using the word the Negroes differentiated. "Buckra man," "big buckra," "rich buckra," or simply "buckra" meant the old slave holding class or better class of white people. When it was applied to the "cracker" element or "poor white trash," "poor buckra" was used. Even if one of the "cracker" element accumulated a little money or property he was referred to by the Negroes as "nothing but a damn poor buckra." It was blood that counted.

HENRY A. WALLACE.

New York City.

War Risk Insurance

SIR: Your editorial in the issue of December 29th, upon the failure of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance to meet its obligations to the ex-service men, implies some misconceptions as to its functions and its accomplishments.

For instance, you state that of a total of between 500,000 and 600,000 men discharged from the army with disabilities, only 20,000 are now in hospitals. This would imply that all of the 500,000 or 600,000 should now be in hospitals or were suitable for hospitalization, or still needed hospitalization. As a matter of fact, there have been examined under the auspices of this Bureau for the purposes of determining whether the disabilities which were claimed were of service origin, and if so were of sufficient degree to permit of compensation and hospitalization under the law, 536,128 men. 65,280 ex-service men have had such hospitalization as has been suitable for their case, and approximately 500,000 out-patient treatment have been given at the dispensaries and hospitals provided by the United States Public Health Service during the year ended June, 1920.

Your editorial would imply that there is no coordination of the services of the three bureaus involved. As a matter of fact joint offices are used by the three bureaus concerned, where the appropriations and laws permit, and at any one of these offices the administration of the various services which the government is authorized to offer under the law are being provided by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, the Bureau of the Public Health Service, and the Vocational Board.

There is the closest practicable cooperation in the district offices, and between the bureaus through intimate liaison of medical and administrative officers in Washington.

What you properly designate as preferential treatment for the ex-service men who have been disabled or are sick and injured as a result of military service, can and will be provided promptly, as soon as the Congress provides buildings and service so that the government can, within its own hospitals, give diagnosis and care equal, in quantity and quality, to the best that is obtainable in civilian hospitals.

The governmental agencies having to do with the care and treatment of disabled veterans of the World War are utilizing present obtainable facilities to the utmost.

R. G. CHOLMELEY-JONES,
Director.

Washington, D. C.

"An English Lordling's Flunkey"

SIR: We are "mad revolutionists" because we tear off the veil of Junker hypocrisy and show to the world the clay feet of your god. You are worried about the good name of England, not about the earning of a good name by England.

Your supercilious attitude towards the Sinn Feiners is that of the bastard of an English lordling's flunkey towards a free man. A tool and dupe of Junker propaganda is too expensive a luxury for me. Don't send your worthless drivel to me any longer.

P. A. FORDE.

Elbon, South Dakota.

French Imperialism

SIR: I find in Raymond Poincaré's Chronicle of the year in the Revue des deux Mondes for November 15, 1920, page 440, the following expression of imperialism.

"But our great African possessions becoming more and more prosperous, had naturally created in the black continent a variety of interests. It was our duty to guarantee this on the east, the south and the west against the attacks of natives and the schemes of Europeans. Thus we have been led successfully to occupy Tunis, to extend toward the Soudan our little colony of Sénégal, to mount on the coast of Dahomey toward the Niger, to penetrate into the basin of the Congo, and the Oubanghi and finally to establish our authority over Morocco; at the same time, to spare the Island of Réunion from a stranger neighborhood, we installed ourselves at Madagascar, and to protect the back country of Saigon we have taken possession of Annam and Tonkin."

In regard to Réunion we may note that the island which the seizure of Madagascar was designed to protect has a diameter of about thirty-six miles and a population about 175,000. Madagascar has an area of 590,000 square kilometers, being about the size of France, including Corsica, Alsace and Lorraine, the length of the island itself being about 1,000 miles.

DAVID STARR JORDAN.

Stanford University, California.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VERSE

The Lion and the Lamb

I saw a Tiger's golden flank,
I saw what food he ate,
By a desert spring he drank;
The Tiger's name was Hate.

Then I saw a placid Lamb
Lying fast asleep;
Like a river from its dam
Flashed the Tiger's leap.

I saw a Lion tawny-red
Terrible and brave;
The Tiger's leap overhead
Broke like a wave.

In sand below or sun above
He faded like a flame.
The Lamb said, "I am Love";
"Lion, tell your name."

The Lion's voice thundering
Shook his vaulted breast,
"I am Love. By this spring
"Brother, let us rest."

Valentine

Too high, too high to pluck
My heart shall swing.
A fruit no bee shall suck,
No wasp shall sting.

If on some night of cold
It falls to ground
In apple-leaves of gold
I'll wrap it round.

And I shall seal it up
With spice and salt,
In a carven silver cup,
In a deep vault.

Before my eyes are blind
And my lips mute,
I must eat core and rind
Of that same fruit.

Before my heart is dust
At the end of all,
Eat it I must, I must
Were it bitter gall.

But I shall keep it sweet
By some strange art;
Wild honey I shall eat
When I eat my heart.

O honey cool and chaste
As clover's breath!
Sweet Heaven I shall taste
Before my death.

The Eagle and the Mole

Avoid the reeking herd,
Shun the polluted flock,
Live like that stoic bird
The eagle of the rock.

The huddled warmth of crowds
Begets and fosters hate;
He keeps, above the clouds,
His cliff inviolate.

When flocks are folded warm,
And herds to shelter run,
He sails above the storm,
He stares into the sun.

If in the eagle's track
Your sinews cannot leap,
Avoid the lathered pack,
Turn from the steaming sheep.

If you would keep your soul
From spotted sight or sound,
Live like the velvet mole;
Go burrow underground.

And there hold intercourse
With roots of trees and stones,
With rivers at their source,
And disembodied bones.

The Bird

O clear and musical!
Sing again! sing again!
Hear the rain fall
Through the long night.
Bring me your song again
O dear delight!

O dear and comforting!
Mine again! mine again!
Hear the rain sing
And the dark rejoice!
Shine like a spark again
O clearest voice!

ELINOR WYLIE.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Chesterton Speaks

ALMOST before he opened his mouth, his New York audience began to laugh. They had read Chesterton in the Saturday Evening Post, I think. They knew him, at any rate, as a humorist and a man of paradox, and they were all ready to be entertained by him. It was in their thirst for entertainment that people fought to get in to his first New York lecture. It was this that made able-bodied women wrench tickets from miserable literary males.

But there is something appallingly serious about the lecture platform. That reading-stand, and the glass of water, and the undertaker-uniform of evening clothes! Chesterton began lightly enough. It was merely necessary for him to refer to his own bulk to have his listeners ripple, and when he said his voice was the original mouse that came from the mountain they unanimously laughed. Unfortunately, it had little to do with reality. The country that gazed on William Howard Taft during the years he was President knows a man of girth when it sees one, and Chesterton is a bantam compared to the presidential Taft. His voice, in addition, is the ordinary good lecture-hall voice, with an occasional trick of Rooseveltian falsetto. It wasn't, of course, a bellow. Neither was it a squeak. And the people only laughed when he referred to it because laughter was their cue. But before he had gone very long, in his slow and well-prepared lecture, the quantity of laughter lessened. As he made his serious points, one section or another would respond partially. The house as a whole only rose to him three or four times after the preliminaries. He did not live up to its expectations as a clown.

And yet, if he had had more snap, he'd have been an excellent clown. When he began twitting "the ignorance of the educated" on the subject of central Europe, and suggested that Slovene was the female of Slovak, he was well on the way to slap-stick. And he was actually quite mirthful on the subject of the Missing Link. The audience enjoyed the missing-ness of the Missing Link, and yet acknowledged that as a mythological figure no one was clearer than the hairy hiatus. The history of prehistoric man earned another genial laugh from the audience. And at Chesterton's suggestion that there was something wrong with the notion of primitive man *always* dragging his female by the hair into his cave, the audience was delighted. It was delighted when he asked how, if the cave-man was so rude, the cave-woman happened to be so refined.

With such material as this, however, one needed a greater sense of spontaneity than Chesterton's slow pace permitted. His was a conjuring trick in which one saw the wheels go round. His natural pace, one felt, was ever so much faster. He was either unaccustomed to this sort of lecture-audience or had been stage-managed. The result was unfortunate. It was as if each champagne bubble turned into a soap bubble, and took a minute to burst.

The same glum sobriety attached itself to the intellectual purpose of his lecture. His real point, I gathered, was to direct attention to the vast number of unexamined premises that the newspapers have taken from pseudo-science and put in circulation; and also the preferability of "our ancient faith" in God and the saints and angels to our modern faith in man and superman. The attack on modernism took the form of tracing prehistoric man from his cave to his tribe and his tribe to his nation, through oligarchy and feudalism and monarchy and democracy, to the promise of something like the World State. All of this fable, according to Chesterton, is a mass of lies. He called H. G. Wells a very great man, and a very sincere one, but he challenged every article of scientific faith in the Outline of History, and referred to Wells as already obsolescent, "the last of the Darwinians." He lumped the whole thing as the ignorance of the educated, and put the belief in natural selection on all-fours with the belief in Anglo-Wurtemburgers or Anglo-Saxons. The Superman, he said in effect, was as dead as Progress, and a good deal deader than the Holy Trinity.

Well, it sounded feeble. The "ignorance" which Chesterton tackled was either something he ludicrously misunderstood, like the distinction between Slovaks and Slovenes, or it was something he preposterously exaggerated, like the hypothesis of primitive man. As he went on scoring up his triumphs, one after the other, I felt he was like a peculiarly well-fed and rather drowsy bull into whom the management kept sending one octogenerian cab-horse after another, and when these ancient cab-horses were gored to death, to slow music, nothing came out except sawdust and red ink.

I was glad to see him finish the "Anglo-Saxon" race. Although spavinned and splintered, it keeps wheezing around. I was glad to see him poke his horn into the midriff of the World State. The World State of Mr. Wells recalls to me his neatness about the problem of the colored races: "They have got to go!" Since he made that large decision, so characteristic of the super-responsible journalist, I am sure he has seen fit to revise it, but about that idea of the World State there still clings the atmosphere of journalistic super-responsibility and super-simplicity which makes such inhuman nonsense possible. The idea of world-organization is today as inescapable as the tooth-brush. Everybody has it. But the form which that organization is to take may or may not be a State, and the more it is a matter of consultation and not promulgation the better. The promulgation of human destiny by publicists is already one of the banes of existence. But while Chesterton did show how impudent the pseudo-scientist could be, he chose extraordinarily easy marks in the general field of ideas. And in some cases it was the conventionalization he went after, not the real idea that has been conventionalized.

So with primitive man. If the war did nothing else, it vindicated the new-fashioned psychologists who had insisted on man's thronging instincts and the slightness of his political acquisition. As against Chesterton's German-baiting, a nasty parochialism in the light of the unprincipled peace of Versailles, it would be well to set a general theory of behavior based on the very scientists that Chesterton despises. But it is hopeless to expect this from a man whose critical faculty is exhausted by modernism and who falls back sublimely uncritical into the arms of ancient faith.

And yet the impression he gave as a personality was decidedly pleasant. He had real fervor and real dignity whenever he touched on the large aspirations of democracy. He had real simplicity and humility when he spoke of his own infection by the intellectual vulgarities which he had undertaken to condemn. And, even under the handicap of stage light and stage inhibition, he gave the notion of being a genuine humorist, a person able to laugh in the face of his own largest assumptions. It was this I liked best about him. There is something about a man with genuine humor which turns aside the spear of criticism, the barb of animosity and contempt. Even if Chesterton is fearfully wrong about all sorts of things, his humor is a complete amelioration. It does not lessen the clash of encounter or soften the wound, but it makes the encounter hearty and the wound clean. It makes it pleasant even when he speaks of human brotherhood. A brotherhood of humorous brothers would be a real thing. F. H.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Our Common Humanity

What is on the Worker's Mind, by Whiting Williams. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

SLOWLY the books on industrial management are being weeded out, and when the process is complete, Mr. Williams's book is likely to remain. He puts on overalls for seven months and here reports what he found "on the worker's mind." The essential message of these months in steel mills, mines and shipyards is extremely simple, and not at all new—however much in need of rediscovery it may be. The men in overalls are ordinary human beings. "In all of us the mainsprings are just about the same, though different circumstances require different modes and methods of their escapement." These mainsprings Mr. Williams has characterized in a fresh, graphic way and whether he gives a complete account of human motivation or not, he gives enough to be illuminating. "From all that I have seen or heard all kinds of human beings do and say, it is safe to assert that every normal person possesses in the bottom of his heart the desire to find somewhere the satisfaction that comes with the consciousness of 'breaking through'. . . . counting as something more than a cipher in the sum total of humanity." "Every person is moved to do what he does by the universal itch to feel that somewhere on life's front he is justifying his existence among other persons by 'getting on.'" And elsewhere there is a phrase about the "rock bottom desire to achieve a sense of individual worthwhileness."

The central trouble which Mr. Williams found in industry was this inability of the worker to secure an adequate satisfaction for his sense of individual worth in and through the job. He is thus at one with other acute students of the industrial process in urging that work must be so organized as to make it a source of creative release to the worker. Nor is he in doubt about the possibility of accomplishing this if only the proper supplementary precautions are observed. Like every expert who has taken pains to know individual operations, Mr. Williams finds that jobs do not readily fall into two classes—the interesting or the uninteresting. Rather is it possible to recover to the performance of many seemingly routine pieces of work an interest which can bring considerable satisfaction, if only pains are taken to let the worker understand and to a certain extent control what he is doing.

The suggestions growing out of this study are based on an attempt to view administrative procedure through the worker's eyes and they confirm strikingly the conclusions of experts in personnel administration. The sub-boss and foreman "hog too much of the satisfaction" of knowing what is going on and why. These subordinate executives all too frequently are hard masters who can only with difficulty be made to interpret a humane spirit in the central management. Hence the need of special attention to the equipment of foremen. There is inadequate preliminary instruction for the new worker. Hence the need of a training procedure. The deadly twins, tiredness and temper, are given too much chance to thrive. The eight-hour day, rest periods and labor saving machinery will help. The company police and detectives destroy confidence and goodwill faster than all other efforts put together can restore it. The abolition of these is wisely advocated. Finally and most important, the insecurity of the worker's job forbids the development of morale, interest in work and a free mind. The effect of the dark cloud of unemployment always hovering between the horizon and the zenith of the worker's heaven is depressing and stultifying. The remedy here may not be so simple, but at least a national employment service can be organized to distribute intelligence about the actually available jobs.

To a considerable extent Mr. Williams lays the blame of present defects at the door of management. Certainly his evidence of managerial indifference, inertia and incompetence is overwhelming. Understate the conditions as he tries to, the raw edges which obtrude through his picture allow the imagination to fill out a succession of scenes of callous inhumanity, of goods produced at tremendous costs in backache, heartache, anxiety, sweat and blood. Scrupulously unsentimental as Mr. Williams tries to be, persistently optimistic as he temperamentally is, the discerning reader will find him telling a story of blood and iron which—were our generation not so habituated to it—would be seen in all its naked frightfulness and horror.

Yet no such aim actuates the book. It is written strictly with a view to showing managers and consumers how they can modify their conduct to make the present system function properly. Judged within the limits of that purpose the book is a complete success, and if the sensitive reader occasionally gets an attack of the "creeps," that may be because Mr. Williams has gotten under the skin and stimulated a new course of action.

Judged, however, as any book in the long run must be, in the light of the author's ability to see his problem in its entire setting, Mr. Williams's study has one shortcoming which tends to lessen its telling effectiveness. He seems to assume that the organization of the workers into unions is only made necessary by the employers' selfishness and he asserts that if only the employers would be intelligent and "fair" the system would function properly. One need not object because Mr. Williams frankly believes the capitalist system of production is worth bolstering up. That is a question of opinion upon which one man's convictions may be as good as another's. But it is to be expected that in laying bare, as he so vividly does, the weaknesses of factory organization as they affect the worker's mind, he will also raise those questions which the weaknesses of the organization between factories and between industries inevitably and logically occasion.

Mr. Williams went into the mill in a period of industrial prosperity; today unemployment is spreading. Who will say that a proper sense of "fairness" in the individual employer or even in them all would serve to bring a resumption of production? Can the supply of goods ever be adjusted to demand under a competitive system so as to minimize cyclical depressions? Moreover, how are we to differentiate legitimate profit from profiteering in the light of the concept of fairness? Is it "fair" to shut down mills to maintain prices because stockholders demand dividends? Is any employer unfair because he goes in for making pleasure automobiles because they are more profitable than building working class homes? These and a hundred other questions come to mind as data in the case which this study ignores.

If Mr. Williams had said that these are questions which he did not find on the worker's mind, that fact would have been significant. Or if he had said that such questions have nothing to do with the worker's mind that too would have been intelligible—although questionable. In fact he does recognize the existence and relevancy of these larger problems. But when he approaches them a certain hesitancy takes possession of his thinking. He offers the example of the radical propagandists who were assuring their col-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

leagues during a local slump in employment that now was the time to agitate because the unemployed worker was in a receptive frame of mind for socialistic preachments. And he concludes rightly that if society supplies the inflammable chips of idleness, the tinder of radical agitation will set the idle afire with new ideas. But he appears also to conclude that if workers were fed and cared for and work were made more interesting there would be no labor problem. The temporary unemployment does indeed give the agitator his hearing; but does it explain the agitator and his views? Does it, also, explain the regular recurrence of unemployment when goods are needed and numbers of people lack the comforts of life? In short, Mr. Williams slights the fact that in addition to the immediate occasion for "propaganda" there is a growing body of opinion which sees certain permanent defects inherent in the present economic structure, and which therefore denies that the relations of managers to manage must constitute the whole problem.

Short as the book's economic perspective is, its central contribution remains intact; its psychological analysis is penetrating and original. Its educational value can be literally tremendous. The serious danger is that the wisdom and experience of men like Mr. Williams will be at a discount for some months to come because of the ease with which workers can today be "disciplined" by the fear of unemployment. If only it can command a wide enough audience, this book can do its considerable part to make managements realize that the results obtained through this motive of fear are built upon the sand. Mr. Williams bears witness, with an increasing company, to the truth that in an organized appeal to the creative and social impulses lies the only hope of resuscitating industrial morale.

ORDWAY TEAD.

George Meredith

George Meredith: His Life and Friends in Relation to his Work, by S. M. Ellis. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co.

MEREDITH, like Thackeray, forbade the publication of any "official" biography of himself. His immediate family respected the wish and issued only the collection of Letters edited by his son. We have therefore been spared the customary volumes with which illustrious British dead are commemorated, those volumes which, as Mr. Lytton Strachey says, "are as familiar as the cortège of the undertaker and wear the same air of slow, funereal barbarism." But Mr. Ellis, whose father was Meredith's first cousin, has considered himself free from the fetters of family piety and consequently at liberty to reveal, with, apparently, considerable exaggeration of emphasis, various facts that shed rather disconcerting light upon the character of the author of The Egoist.

The first edition of Mr. Ellis's book appeared early in 1919 and was promptly burked by an injunction obtained by the late novelist's legal representatives. No reference to this contretemps is made in the present new edition of the work. That Meredith, in Evan Harrington, misinterpreted and, as the biographer holds, maligned the character of Mr. Ellis's grandparents may, or may not, have been a contributing cause of the publication of this rather shallow and rather malicious book. Certain it is that George Meredith was on no very friendly terms with his Ellis cousins; and the reader must be warned of the evident animus on the part of the biographer. Yet it must be admitted that certain facts speak for themselves regardless of the possibility of the writer's prejudices and even vindictiveness.

As drawn by Mr. Ellis, Meredith is represented as a vain man with that "disposition to be ashamed of socially inferior connections" which denotes the snob. Truths about his origin and family and upbringing that he hid from prying eyes he conveyed by indirection in various books. But the mystery of his birth continued till after his death. He hid successfully the fact that he was the son of a Portsmouth tailor and the grandson, on his mother's side, of the keeper of an inn. Mr. Ellis even hints that the scandalous gossip that circulated at one time that Meredith was the illegitimate son of Bulwer Lytton was not entirely repugnant to him. This is of course preposterous. But it is certain that Portsmouth, his birthplace, remained in after life, save for the bitter transcript of family history in Evan Harrington, a closed book to him. His father lavished fondness upon him without the reward of reciprocated affection and was naturally wounded by the portrait drawn of him in the novel, just mentioned. The novelist was unfitted to meet successfully the domestic situation of life with his first wife, the widowed daughter of Thomas Love Peacock, nine years Meredith's senior, and a woman of intellectual ability sufficient to clash painfully with her husband's irritable genius. The marriage was a calamity and presently Meredith was left with his little son upon whom he heaped such affection as his own father had poured unavailingly on him. There followed some years of anxious happiness, but after a time Arthur Meredith, moved doubtless in part by loyalty to his mother's memory, drifted away, to meet his father but seldom during the remaining years of his short life. Mr. Ellis implies (though he is careful not to state it explicitly) that when Arthur died Meredith refused to attend his funeral. Years before, it seems, he had declined his wife's death-bed request that he come to see her.

Mr. Ellis makes much of Meredith's lack of magnanimity in the face of public indifference to his work. Even in his illustrious old age he kept up the fiction of being ignored, persisting in the attitude of an unappreciated genius, "an unknown poet and an unpopular novelist." I am inclined to believe that Mr. Ellis has taken such whimsicalities too seriously. A more important and disconcerting "revelation" is that Meredith, a leader of progress, was a journalist for hire on the Tory side, writing anonymous articles week by week in support of causes and policies of which, when writing over his own signature, he was the avowed opponent. Cynics will not be shocked by this, but it is damaging to Meredith's reputation.

No exposition of Meredith's philosophy and outlook upon life is included in Mr. Ellis's plan. For such matters the reader must still turn to such commentaries as the excellent little studies by Mr. Trevelyan and by Mr. Crees. When the biographer does attempt to be "appreciative" he is, it must be said, a little weak and rather inclined to gush. But in one respect he furnishes valuable material to the student of the novels. He shows—what has hitherto been known only in the case of such obvious instances as Evan Harrington and The Tragic Comedians—that Meredith almost always drew from the life, that his characters are portraits of contemporary men and women although rendered more puzzling and, to their originals, surely more irritating by the strands of fancy that are usually intertwined with the strands of fact. In most cases, however, his portraits are in no way discreditable to the originals and often they are highly complimentary.

A photograph may be harsh, untouched, bald; but it should not be out of focus. Mr. Ellis's photograph of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Meredith is out of focus. He has been so anxious to bring into high light the elements of snobbishness and pretense in his subject's character that he has blurred and obscured the real grandeur of the man. One may admit that certain parts of Meredith's complex character are a fit subject for the silvery laughter of the Comic Spirit. "The Egoist is all of us," he himself declared and he made no exception of himself. But why not focus attention upon his great qualities? He had strength and determination of character to the point of arrogance. He detected in almost unrivaled fashion the counterfeit in others as in himself. He never declined, as did Swinburne, into the position of a "lost leader," but remained open-minded in old age, a champion of new causes. His utterances on public affairs were clear-sighted and at times prophetic. And as poet he voiced the authentic rapture of man in the presence of nature and youth and love. In the face of such qualities Mr. Ellis's strictures sink into insignificance.

S. C. C.

Shadow-Shapes

Shadow-Shapes. The Journal of a Wounded Woman. By Elizabeth Shepley Sergeant. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

MISS SERGEANT was dangerously wounded while in France as a correspondent. A party of journalists were exploring a battle-field, fresh with a débris of helmets, bayonets, cartridges, shell splinters and other lurid souvenirs. When one of the party carelessly picked up a hand grenade, it exploded, killed her, and sent Miss Sergeant to spend many dark months in a hospital with two badly smashed ankles. Recovery was slow, and the rediscovery of life that every convalescent makes was a long battle in which hope many times nearly gave in to despair. What pulled Miss Sergeant through was her writing: almost every day she jotted down the echoes of the outside world that floated in to her, framing into words old things remembered, describing the messengers from reality that briefly visited her, whether ominous or gay. Shadow-Shapes is the record of this brave and painful spiritual regeneration, and for that reason it is a moving book.

Because she was a woman, and felt keenly how little business a woman had to be wounded among so many men, she turned her sensitiveness to good account. Very vivid is her picture of the front line hospital ward at night: "like a sombre tunnel full of smoke and noxious gases; monstrous moving shadows; painful reverberation." A number of days and nights she spent in this tunnel of beds, haunted by the sounds of uncomfortable or tortured, dying men—sounds ranging from curses, impatient cries for water, to the "one unbearable sound, a dull, pierced, animal plaint, nothing like the usual moan of pain or the cries of the wounded who are being dressed.—A sort of sigh went up from the whole ward when it began."

Then Paris, and civilization, friends, news; echoes from the world; the beginning of a vicarious life. Somebody tells her of the armistice celebration; of the soldier who stumbled against a horse in a parade, and in his joy shouted out "Vivent les chevaux!" After the armistice, a world bumping along on flatter and flatter tires. Wilson arrives, and Miss Sergeant gets the echo of the extraordinary popular welcome to him. Then, later, from a disgusted liberal, an anecdote of evil omen: Wilson kissing his *gloved* hands to the crowd.

When she is not living this life by proxy, Miss Sergeant brings up pictures from her memory: Paris in the air-raided period; all in the well-to-do quarters closed, deserted; but life teeming, unquenchable, insolent and unafraid in the quartier ouvrier of La Nation. Or the difference "between the French peasant who made his toilet in the barnyard, kept his gold in a stocking, and lived frugally on vegetable soup in a house inherited from a revolutionary ancestor, and the sergeant from Ohio, with a chequebook in his pocket, brought up in an apartment on enamelled bathtubs and beefsteak."

But the further one gets into the book, the harder it becomes to cut such clear bits of description from the strains of meditation, sentiment, consciousness that too often alloy them. The descriptions fade suddenly into meditations, the pictures are without warning blurred in a flood of feeling or recollection. What Miss Sergeant sees with her whole attention is extremely interesting, and would be more so were it not so frequently sandwiched between fragments of what she thinks,—which is not half so interesting. To enjoy the book as it deserves, one must take it for a personal record, a pleasant miscellaneous quarry where quite valuable things can be stumbled upon. Unblushingly formless and mixed it is, but evidently Miss Sergeant never took aim at the difficult target of form.

Though Miss Sergeant occasionally cuts loose from her verbal moorings into some admirable sentence of clear, fresh, solid, English words, she is far too hospitable to jargon such as "elemental figure," "human implication"; "I am leaving (hospital) with a dominant sense of the fascination of surgical technique." But hundreds of such mongrel expressions are now loose about the world, and may wander into almost any one's mind. They are not very important. What is important is that Miss Sergeant can, when she really sets about it, do things as good as this portrait.

> "Russia . . . In a private dining-room of a restaurant on the Champ Elysées we are six at the table. On the right of our cosmopolitan and accomplished hostess a face that is both mystical and material, lined and grey as fifty, yet in its plump contour decidedly less than forty. A round, shaven, pugilistic head. A pair of extraordinarily sensitive and beautiful hands which make staccato gestures. A voice that rises, harshly swells, suddenly drowns the tiny room in a flood of oratory big enough for the Trocadéro. The mirrors and panelled doors seem to crack, but the voice roars on, condemning the Allies for lack of help in time of need, condemning the Bolsheviki, condemning Kolchak—till suddenly it breaks and shrivels on a note of truly Russian self-analysis and self-distrust.
>
> "'And they call me a weak man. . . .'
>
> "At which our gifted Florentine host, in his diplomat's voice, hazards a smooth, underlined:
>
> "'Mais, M. le président. . . .'
>
> "The words are magic. Something like a bath of soothing oil spreads slowly over the cropped head and the grey face. Complacency dawns. The tense table draws a long breath and the tactful host inquires: 'Now, M. Kerensky, what practical measures will you suggest to the Conference when you get a hearing? . . .'
>
> "But the voice only grumbles and thunders."

It is a pity that usually Miss Sergeant's warm heart muddles and obscures this clear-cut, imaginative yet detached power of description she evidently possesses. The whole book is pervaded by an atmosphere of intimacy with the world, its ideas and visible shapes that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH

Second Term February 7—May 20, 1921
Registration begins January 31st

Courses in

History, Anthropology, Economics, Psychology, Statistics, Political Theory, Business Research

Given by

Thorstein Veblen, Wesley C. Mitchell, James Harvey Robinson, Leo Wolman, A. A. Goldenweiser, Leon Ardzrooni, Horace M. Kallen, Frederick W. Ellis, Ordway Tead, Lawrence K. Frank, Frederick Macaulay

Late afternoon and evening classes

For outline of courses apply to school

465 West 23rd Street, NEW YORK

Telephone Chelsea 1386

AUSTRIA, GERMANY SERBIA, POLAND

The National Information Bureau has just completed a survey of American relief work in these countries. Full reports are now available to its members. *The Bureau studies national social agencies and reports the facts to those who give and wish to give intelligently.*

G. D. POPE, Detroit, *President*
PAUL L. FEISS, Cleveland, *Vice-Pres. and Treas.*
LAWSON PURDY, New York, *2d Vice-President*
ALLEN T. BURNS, New York, *Secretary*

For membership rates and list of approved agencies, address

National Information Bureau
158 Metropolitan Tower
New York City

Whatever book you want

Wanamaker's

has it, or will get it.

We buy old, rare books, and sets of books

NEW YORK and PHILADELPHIA

THE COURSE OF EMPIRE

by R. F. Pettigrew

(Former U. S. Senator from South Dakota)

This is the **most comprehensive** record of the palmy days of American capitalism and the beginnings of American Imperialism. The momentous events that crowd the years from 1890 to 1901—from the passage of the Sherman Anti-Trust Law to the organization of the Steel Trust, are set forth **more vividly** in this book than in **any yet published.** And it is **AN INSIDE RECORD**—by the man who brought to his job of United States Senator the freedom and vigor of the big West.

The most remarkable characteristic of this book is that it could have been written by a Republican Senator from a staunch Republican State. No one can pretend to have a real library on American politics and government without this invaluable work.

Octavo size, reinforced binding, 712 pages (with index).
Published Price, $4.50.
Special Price to New Republic Readers $3.00 Post Paid.

107 West 40th Street

BONI & LIVERIGHT
NEW YORK
MODERN LIBRARY

WOMAN HER SEX AND LOVE LIFE

A book for every woman married or contemplating marriage. Helps women comprehend and develop their sexual life. Vital knowledge for health and marital happiness. Clear, comprehensive and practical.

Illustrated, 400 pp., $3.00

By WILLIAM J. ROBINSON, M.D.

By the same author:
Sex Knowledge for Men.....$2.00
Birth Control: An Argument..... 1.50
Sexual Problems of Today..... 2.00
Never Told Tales..... 1.50

CRITIC & GUIDE CO.
12B Mt. Morris Park New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

blurs these shapes a little,—makes them indeed Shadow Shapes.

Yet how readable "Shadow-Shapes" is, and what is more, how full of feeling, of generosity, of the gold of human intercourse delicately essayed, of difficult things bravely thought out, of fine things appreciated, of good things described with sympathy, accuracy,—this quite outweighs in my impression of it that vast excess of the sympathy over the accuracy, of the personal over the impersonal which, artistically at least, is a serious fault.

R. L.

On the Road to Castaly

Development, by W. Bryher. New York: The Macmillan Co.

IT is a difficult, inverted book which comes out under the unknown name W. Bryher, purporting to give the story of an imaginative child's development. Its view is perplexingly unstable. For a time it tries to capture a child's mood, but equally or more it seems written by a hovering older person. It also seems autobiographical. It is probably a self-account. It closes when Nancy is twenty; and it comes to read as though it were written at twenty and a half, with its confusions produced by the rapid undetached effort.

Development is without any doubt clearest when it is taken backward, in the light of the later chapters which show a mind consciously struggling to free itself in expression, possessed of a passionate desire to recover the lost golden age of childhood, yet always leaping past that desire because a more immediate problem is so overwhelming. The problem is aesthetic but it is none the less desperate; and the personality which emerges is worth puzzling over.

Nancy—or Miss Bryher—is an imagist, and she is up the tree upon whose branches so many imagists are perched with such an air of fixation. Miss Lowell's introduction is not needed to place her among them—though not of course as being up any sort of tree. Nancy can see, beautifully, exquisitely. She has the typical imagistic power to startle, the typical cerebral intensiveness without intensity, the same fatal abundance. She breaks through from page to page with pictures, which are often crowded and hurried, but occasionally crystalline, reaching a certain completeness in the long free verse poem to Knossos which she insets as a chapter. She has in fact the poet's sensuous equipment, but heightened and exaggerated, tending to be tortuous. And she stops abruptly at the gates of sense. She lacks impulse; she lacks a free flow of feeling. She abounds in critical judgments, about poetry, about herself. But she is constantly inhibited.

The difference between Nancy and some of her fellow-captives is that she is painfully aware of her position. She does not question or analyze her tendency to imagism; she lets herself go on it, scattering passages of delicately sophisticated description even when she is interpreting the mind of Nancy, aged four. But she recognizes her basic unresponsiveness, and she becomes bitterly uneasy. She beats against the fact, tries to discover reasons for it; she has apparently written this book in the blind effort to find her way out.

Her theory is that she has merely strayed from enchanted ground or has been forced away. As a child she was all poet, she thinks; and perhaps she was. Her childhood was flooded with the wonder of an ancient external world, Sicily and Greece and Egypt. An "epic childhood" she calls it, and its color runs through her story. She dwells upon it, embroiders around it; and is constantly driven back to her present quandary. She believes that it is school which has paralyzed her, the two years of school which began at fifteen. She writes of school with an entire hatred, in one of the few wholly lucid passages of the book, successfully lampooning its wasteful processes and showing up its dull mechanics.

She may well be right about the effect of school. But it is as easy to argue that she was unable to withstand its unexpected onslaught because of some temperamental inferiority, or because her earlier life made her too completely passive. As a child she lacked human contacts; and she lacked any sort of compulsion for expression. She became merely absorptive. Now, instead of meeting experience with that perennial freshness which is part of the poet's heritage, she clings to the childish past.

Whether because of school or because of some other hidden disruption Nancy is the victim of an arrested poetic development, and the whole of her case is suggestive. She sums up a kind of poetic infantilism. It is not only that she longs to become again a child. The gifts which she so obsessantly and narrowly uses are at bottom infantile—the simple gifts of the senses. In childhood these are primary; but in a natural growth they should take a rich subordinate place. Whether Nancy will come out on the poetic highroad it is impossible to tell from this book.

She is full of question, and she may break through. In some of the later pages there lifts a partial breadth of rhythm as if a real lyricism were stirring underneath. Her promised sequential volume Adventure may furnish an answer. But even if it does not show her a poet it will be welcome if, like this book, it submits a mind in gestation—further gestation. Development is not a novel, as it is called. It is a personal record. It belongs more particularly with Miss Richardson's Pilgrimage; and though it is neither so flexible nor so constantly true as Pilgrimage, in one important respect it strikes a more vivid arc.

The chief complaint leveled against Miss Richardson's sequence is that Miriam Henderson, however faithfully rendered, is not worth writing about. This cannot be said of Nancy. Inarticulate as she is, here is a personality of complicated power. Thwarted and divided, she makes war. She is also valuable for her ingenuous betrayal of a current literary type.

CONSTANCE MAYFIELD ROURKE.

Contributors

ESTHER E. LAPE is chairman of the Committee on American Citizenship of the New York State League of Women Voters.

PETER CONSTABLE is a pseudonym for a theological scholar.

SAVEL ZIMAND is a member of the Bureau of Industrial Research of New York City.

LOUIS I. DUBLIN is Statistician of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company.

ZECHARIAH CHAFEE, JR., is Professor at the Harvard Law School. His book, Freedom of Speech, has just been published.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED